

Frederic O. Musser

The History of Goucher College, 1930–1985



Frederic O. Musser

The History of Goucher College, 1930–1985

When Goucher College was founded in Baltimore in 1885, its mission was to provide quality education for women. Goucher would pursue that mission for the next century. In this sequel to an earlier history that chronicled the college's first fifty years, Frederic O. Musser tells the story of Goucher's second half-century.

Drawing on the college archives as well as on extensive interviews with faculty, alumnae, and staff, Musser presents an overview of Goucher's history since 1930 and looks at the changes those years have brought to Goucher student life. He describes the war years, when Goucher women studied air navigation, radio electronics, and naval cryptography . . . the postwar enrollment crisis brought on when the Baltimore *Evening Sun* published excerpts from the chaplain's "sex sermon" . . . and the turbulent 60s, when campus protests against racial segregation led to the arrest of some Goucher students.

Goucher's second half-century was a time of transition and new challenges. In the early 1930s, President David A. Robertson introduced a radically new curriculum. A decade later Otto Kraushaar oversaw the move from downtown Baltimore to the college's present location in the city's northern suburbs. Kraushaar's successor, Marvin B. Perry, Jr., faced heavy budget deficits that threatened the quality of Goucher's educational program. Rhoda Dorsey succeeded in returning Goucher to a sound financial

(continued on back flap)

The History of Goucher College,
1930-1985

The Goucher College Series

Frederic O. Musser

*The History
of Goucher
College,*



1930-1985

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY
PRESS
BALTIMORE AND LONDON

© 1990 The Johns Hopkins University Press
All rights reserved
Printed in the United States of America

The Johns Hopkins University Press
701 West 40th Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21211
The Johns Hopkins Press Ltd., London

⊗The paper used in this book meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Musser, Frederic O., 1930—
The history of Goucher College, 1930–1985 / Frederic O. Musser.
p. cm. — (The Goucher College series)
Includes bibliographical references.
ISBN 0-8018-3902-5 (alk. paper)
1. Goucher College—History. I. Title. II. Series.
LD2001.G77M87 1990
378.752'71—dc20 89-35238 CIP

To three outstanding women: Elizabeth Conolly Todd, who made the writing possible; Rhoda Mary Dorsey, who guided and supported the writer; and Alma Elizabeth Nugent, who made the writing readable.

C o n t e n t s

Foreword by Eli Velder ix

Acknowledgments xvii

<i>Part One</i>	<i>The Robertson Administration (1930–1948)</i>	
One	A Watershed Year: 1930	3
Two	Restructuring the College (1930–1937)	9
Three	The Beginning of “Greater Goucher” (1938–1942)	29
Four	The Final Years of the Robertson Administration (1941–1948)	44
<i>Part Two</i>	<i>The Kraushaar Administration (1948–1967)</i>	
Five	Early Perceptions of Goucher by a New President (1948)	57
Six	Completion of the “Minimal Campus” (1948–1954)	67
Seven	Completing the Campus: The Final Stage	75
Eight	Goucher’s Remarkable Real Estate Transactions	85
Nine	Faculty, Students, and Curriculum (1948–1967)	92
Ten	The Alumnae Fund and the 75th Anniversary Campaign	118
Eleven	Controversies and Dilemmas	125
Twelve	Student Life in the Kraushaar Era	132

<i>Part Three</i>	<i>The Perry Administration (1967–1973)</i>	
Thirteen	Student Activism: The Temper of the Times	149
Fourteen	The Committee on the Future of the College	161
Fifteen	Major Financial Problems: Reality versus Mirage	174
Sixteen	A Final Overview of the Perry Years	189
<i>Part Four</i>	<i>The Dorsey Administration (1973–)</i>	
Seventeen	A New President Faces Old Challenges (1973–1979)	197
Eighteen	Other Developments in the Life of the College (1973–1979)	207
Nineteen	The Goucher Academic Program (1973–1985)	215
Twenty	The End of the First Hundred Years (1980–1985)	233
Afterword	The Transition to Coeducation	247
	Notes	253
	Bibliography	283
	Index	285

F o r e w o r d

Despite the major curricular restructuring that took place in 1934, 1958, 1970, and the early 1980s, the end product in 1985 bears an almost uncanny resemblance, *mutatis mutandis*, to the academic program with which the college opened in 1888." This fascinating conclusion reached by Frederic Musser toward the end of chapter 19, in which he describes Goucher's academic program during the Dorsey administration, prompts a number of questions. What were the bases for these four curricular revisions? Were these changes similar to those made in other institutions? If they differed, how did they do so, and why? These questions led me to review some of the educational developments of the last fifty years to understand the curricular changes at Goucher College in the context of national trends and events.

Those of us in the field of education view the curriculum as an organized response to a series of basic questions. What, for example, is the role, purpose, or goal of a college education? Is it to prepare a student for a career, or is it to transmit a broad general body of knowledge and thereby provide each student with a common cultural background? Closely related to this is the question of whether everyone should be exposed to a generally accepted canon as represented by the Great Books approach, or whether each individual should have the opportunity to select one's course of study. Further, what should be the emphasis within each course? Should the student be expected to absorb a vast body of knowledge or should one emphasize the methodology inherent in each academic discipline? Finally, in a time of rapid expansion of knowledge, is it realistic to expect coverage of a field, or would it be more reasonable to concentrate on ways of thinking, methods of questioning, and on the process of research in that field? These questions are

just several examples of the diverse considerations undergirding various curricula.

How one chooses to answer these questions depends on a number of factors. The political, social, economic, and intellectual forces of a given period, when combined with the nature of the academic leadership in a specific college, are some of the considerations leading to the adoption of a particular curriculum. As conditions change, existing course offerings are often found to be inadequate to meet the new demands. Hence, changes are continuously being introduced both within individual academic institutions and across the nation.

The period between the two world wars witnessed extensive curricular change in institutions of higher education. Dissatisfied with the results of the free elective system first introduced at Harvard at the end of the nineteenth century, and sensing that this system no longer answered the needs of a post World War I society, educators began urging the adoption of a curriculum that would stress general education for all students, regardless of their immediate areas of interest and their ultimate professional goals. Colleges would emphasize the broad, general intellectual trends that would provide their graduates with the skills and understanding needed to respond to the changing challenges of society and to enhance the quality of their lives. Thus in the 1920s and 1930s, various colleges and universities created a series of survey and interdisciplinary courses. Columbia introduced its famous "Contemporary Civilization" course, Chicago adopted a general course in the natural sciences titled "The Nature of the World and Man," and Dartmouth instituted its "Problems of Democracy."

While this approach represented the major trend in curricular innovation, another philosophy, the Progressive Movement in education, grounded in and encouraged by John Dewey, produced an entirely different curriculum. It shifted the focus from content and subject matter to the students themselves. Education, the progressive educators argued, is all inclusive and should be tailored to the needs, interests, and abilities of the individual student. Instead of only academic courses or a curriculum imposed from the outside, education should include all aspects of the human experience and encourage students to reflect on their needs, doubts, and confusions so as to reach some understanding of themselves and their society and to develop guidelines for their own behavior. By the 1930s this focus on the individual had made some inroads in elementary and secondary schools, leading a small number of colleges, including such schools as Bennington, Sarah Lawrence, and Stephens College, to adopt an experimental approach providing an individualized program based on the progressive principles of life adjustment.

These national trends occurred during President Robertson's administration at Goucher. How then does Goucher's curriculum of that period fit into this larger picture? The answer to this question is not a simple one, for the 1934 plan does not fit neatly into either the main thrust of general education or the progressive experimental approach. True, the eight objectives of the new plan are reminiscent of the seven cardinal principles actively espoused by the progressive educators. The Goucher objectives include such non-academic concerns as physical and mental health and establishing satisfying relations with individuals

and with groups. Yet they also contain the academic goals espoused by those educators who created the more structured general education courses. Moreover, the restructuring of Goucher's curriculum into an upper and lower division and the introduction of the sophomore general examinations are reminiscent of the curricular reforms adopted at the University of Chicago, without, however, the sharp separation between the upper and lower divisions of the Chicago model. In short, Goucher's new plan emerges as a blend of the features of both the general education and progressive movements of the time. The administering of this new plan provided for a faculty advisor and a student to develop a program of studies based on the eight objectives, one which would suit the needs of each student. To assure the attainment of these goals, the student was required to complete successfully the Sophomore General Examination. Thus, standards of academic excellence were maintained while the means of attaining them remained flexible. This emphasis on excellence and individual flexibility is a characteristic that many of us associate with this College. Thus, the new plan seems to have captured the special qualities of Goucher.

The decades following World War II ushered in a series of fundamental changes, all of which would exercise a profound influence throughout higher education. These curricular revisions can be described as three distinct waves that seem to correlate conveniently with the successive administrations of Presidents Kraushaar, Perry, and Dorsey.

A new era emerged at the end of World War II, an era faced with the threat of nuclear destruction, soon to be followed by the threat of the Cold War and the Korean War. A decade later the Space Age arrived with the Soviet Union's successful launching of *Sputnik* and the resulting race to the moon. New questions then arose: How should the United States, now a leading world power, prepare itself for its new role in a technologically sophisticated society requiring highly trained specialists? Were the reforms in general education developed in the thirties still valid, or should these broad liberal courses be replaced by specialized, pre-professional courses? Can higher education provide a curriculum combining the specialized demands of a technologically advanced society with the general, interdisciplinary courses needed to produce broadly educated, cultured individuals? The answer to this last question was sought by Harvard University when it published *General Education in a Free Society*, which Frederick Rudolph (in his *Curriculum, A History of the American Undergraduate Course of Study since 1636* [San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publications, 1978] p. 258) called a "landmark document." The Harvard Report—the Red Book, as it has come to be called—recognized the necessity for rigorous, specialized academic programs to solve the problems of a nuclear space-age society. But would that be enough? Should a free society not be concerned about the individuals who would become the leaders of the future?

Assuming that interdisciplinary, general education courses would develop those characteristics desirable for an intelligent citizenry, the Red Book outlined a program that recommended that six of the sixteen required courses be designed for general education. Of these six, students would be required to complete a minimum of one course each in the humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences. A new course "Great Texts in Literature" would satisfy the humanities require-

ment and would represent a reasonable compromise between the extremes of Columbia's Contemporary Civilization or Chicago's Great Books approach on the one hand and the emphasis on a pre-professional, specialized program urged by the opponents of general education on the other. A social science course might, for example, be titled "American Democracy" and would deal with current contemporary problems in the context of historical developments. This course, like that in the humanities, would include readings of recognized classics in the various fields. To satisfy the requirements for the natural sciences, the report suggested developing a course for both science and non-science majors, perhaps organized in terms of the history of science. Thus, a program would be developed that would include "cultural breadth and intermingled disciplines" (Richard Norton Smith, *The Harvard Century, The Making of a University to a Nation* [New York: Simon and Schuster, 1986], p. 163).

President Kraushaar arrived in Baltimore just three years after the publication of the Harvard Report. His familiarity with this report and his work at Smith College in revising the curriculum naturally affected his views on higher education. It is not surprising, therefore, to see the influence of the Red Book on Goucher's curricular revisions of the 1950s. The three interdisciplinary courses introduced in 1952-53 and the distribution requirements of 1958 echo the recommendations of the Harvard Report. Nonetheless, Goucher's 1958 curriculum revisions go considerably beyond the Red Book. The structuring of all courses into one of three levels of difficulty and sophistication responded to the need for providing an orderly, sequential exposure to each academic discipline, and at the same time encouraged a greater degree of academic rigor. This combination of breadth and specialization kept Goucher's uniqueness in mind. President Kraushaar's mandate to the Special Committee on General Education, for example, includes the charge "to develop a program in which an inherent flexibility and adaptability to the educational needs of individual students would be products of reconciliation of freedom and control" (Musser, chap. 9). Thus, the emphasis on academic excellence and concern for the individual student characterized Goucher's curricular developments both in the 1934 and in the 1958 reforms.

Events in the turbulent sixties brought a halt to the efforts toward educational reform based on rigor, structure, and specialization. As students became involved in the civil rights and anti-war movements and directed more and more of their time and energy to these causes, they began to feel that existing courses of study and the emphasis on fulfilling requirements were irrelevant to their current needs. Having learned to highlight their protests in the political arena, they turned their attention to reforming the curricular offerings. These student demands, coupled with support from faculty members, produced radical changes in the curriculum.

While the cry for relevance received a great deal of attention, it was not the only issue that directed change away from requirements and structure and moved the curriculum toward freedom and flexibility. Other issues arose from basic pedagogical questions raised at this time. The notion of requirements, based on the assumption that all students

need certain courses because they are essential for all educated people, was questioned seriously. No agreement arose among those who wrestled with this dilemma of defining essential courses, and the absence of agreement itself raised the question: Why insist on requirements? Let the students select the courses which they find important for their own needs. Such an approach would transfer the responsibility for education from the college to the individual, where it rightly belongs.

Those who espoused this position found support in Rogerian psychology, which maintains that one cannot teach anyone else anything that is substantive or important. Only the student can learn. Education does not, therefore, consist of a teacher's transmitting knowledge to a group of students who absorb the material; rather, according to this theory, it is a combined process in which teacher and students together participate in the teaching-learning process. This being so, what should be the content of this teaching-learning process? In light of the explosion of knowledge that had occurred in all fields of academic endeavor during the last few decades, coverage of content was no longer possible. Therefore, the reformers urged that courses should emphasize processes of thinking, of questioning, of experimenting, and of finding supporting evidence. This raised a further question: How does one evaluate such an educational program? The activists had an answer for this too: eliminate grades, since they are essentially irrelevant and meaningless. If one needs a grade for purposes of the transcript, why not simply use the pass/fail option?

These protests and demands on the part of the students and the support provided by some faculty members brought about radical reforms in the college curriculum. Examples are many. Project Change-over at Stephens College, for example, asserted that 90 percent of the curriculum was irrelevant. Students were encouraged to create their own courses, and Stephens would simply provide the environment to enable students to learn (*Chronicle of Higher Education*, 12 July 1967). One year later, Stanford eliminated the English, foreign language, and western civilization requirements. Departments that still required a foreign language, however, had to allow at least 50 percent of the program to remain elective (*Chronicle*, 9 December 1968). Brown University also gave students the freedom to design their own courses of study; only grades of A, B, or C could be granted, and courses emphasizing "modes of thought" were to replace survey courses (*Chronicle*, 16 June 1969).

To further encourage innovative and experimental courses and experiences, many colleges instituted a new academic calendar consisting of two regular semesters and a January term. By 1972 over five hundred colleges were using the 4-1-4 plan to provide what the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (17 January 1972) called a "chance for off-beat study." At the same time, 60 percent of colleges were offering the pass/fail grading option as an additional incentive to greater freedom in course selection (*Chronicle*, 6 March 1972). Indeed, during President Perry's administration at Goucher, both the 4-1-4 academic calendar and the pass-fail option were introduced. In addition, President Perry's Committee on the Future of the College (CFC) recommended a number of proposals similar to those adopted in colleges throughout the country. Distribution requirements were narrowed to include any two

courses in each of the areas of the humanities, the social sciences, and the natural sciences. Furthermore, the CFC suggested that the academic program should be more student focused and less discipline focused.

At the same time, Goucher adhered to more traditional principles. Although the CFC proposed a reduction in the foreign language requirement, the faculty rejected this proposal in favor of retaining the emphasis on foreign language proficiency. Even the CFC report questions the advisability of drastic change. It states specifically that "these proposed shifts in emphasis [are to be viewed] as changes in degree rather than in kind, and it [the committee] reaffirms Goucher's traditional commitment to an undergraduate academic experience which combines high quality and flexibility, and experimentation which encourages individual growth and self-discovery." Once again, Goucher's emphasis on quality and on the needs of each student forms the underpinning of another series of curricular changes.

Conditions in the 1970s, however, began to raise serious questions about the validity of the curricular approaches of the 1960s. Reports from national studies, for example, indicated a decline not only in student performance on the SAT and achievement tests, but also in student applications to college. Those students seeking a college education were increasingly motivated by a desire to improve their earning power rather than the ideal of a broadening educational experience. These problems were all exacerbated by the overwhelming financial crisis of the period. Headlines in issue after issue of the *Chronicle of Higher Education* reflect its seriousness: "Financial Crisis Worsens for Colleges. Some Close, Many Show Deficits" (31 August 1970); "Deficit of Average Private College Increases by Five Fold in One Year" (11 January 1970); "One Hundred Institutions Reported Facing Fiscal Disaster" (27 September 1971). Reports of the financial problem continue in this vein for a number of years.

How did colleges react to these challenging problems? One way was to create a new, more attractive curriculum that emphasized practical, professional, or career training. Earl Cheit, in *The Useful Arts and the Liberal Traditions*, asserted that a program based on the useful arts and professional education provides a "greater clarity of purpose" and serves as a valuable basis for restructuring a college education (*Chronicle*, 6 October 1975). Along the same line, twenty-three institutions received grants from the Carnegie Foundation to develop an alternative undergraduate curriculum that included career education, holistic learning, and interdisciplinary courses (*Chronicle*, 10 March 1975).

This new emphasis on career preparation, combined with the existing open-ended curriculum of the 1960s, was not without impact. The report, *Changing Practices in Undergraduate Education*, published in 1976 by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, found that general education courses declined from 43 percent of the curriculum in 1967 to 33 percent in 1974 (*Chronicle*, 28 June 1976). In response to these trends, the proponents of the liberal arts began to mount a campaign against career education in favor of strengthening the general education component of the undergraduate curriculum, including a return to a more structured approach. Even the popular press raised questions about the validity of a smorgasbord approach to education and compared the existing open-ended free election of

courses to a Chinese menu. Professional educators expressed concern about the narrowness of graduates from academic programs based on free-choice and/or career preparation. President Steven Muller of the Johns Hopkins University, for example, lamented that institutions of higher education were producing "skilled people who are literary barbarians."

To counteract this production of skilled barbarians, proponents of the liberal arts urged the reintroduction of general education programs that would lend a unity and coherence to the fragmented curriculum of the sixties, would emphasize rational, higher-level critical thinking, and would provide the students with a common core of knowledge essential in an age of cultural diversity. "In an increasingly complex world," concludes the Carnegie Council's *Changing Practices in Higher Education*, "expertise has a high value . . . however, not all of society's problems can be solved by the specialist. In fact one might argue that society does not need more specialists, for the complexity of the world's problems requires people with a broad and liberal education, people who understand interrelationships between the parts of a problem and who have mastered the art of learning so that they can shift the focus of their efforts when social needs require it" (*Chronicle*, 28 June 1976).

Still, this renewed, broad, and liberal education took different forms among colleges and universities. Some, like St. Johns in Annapolis, continued with the Great Books approach; others, like Stanford, introduced a survey course in western civilization which included some of the great books; still others created a core program which permitted elective courses to fulfill a common core of knowledge required of all students. This last approach is one which Dean Henry Rosovsky instituted at Harvard. Every student there must elect seven to ten courses specifically designed to meet the requirements of "substantive" work in five areas; literature and arts, history, social and philosophical analysis, science and mathematics, and foreign language and culture. In addition, Harvard students must attain proficiency in writing, in mathematics through algebra, and in reading in a foreign language. Thus, approximately one fourth of the students' undergraduate program is devoted to general education.

Again, in the 1970s and 1980s, Goucher charted a course between these two curricular responses to the challenges of professional and career preparation on the one hand and broad general education on the other. True, there are elements of professional and career preparation in the new requirements adopted during the administration of President Dorsey. The off-campus experience and the creation of such career-oriented courses as management, computer science, historic preservation, journalism, and technical writing could be cited as examples of a professional development curriculum. But even these courses and experiences are based on a strong foundation of traditional liberal arts programs. No new departments were created; instead, these new courses were added to existing departments to ensure that the students have the theoretical foundations of an academic discipline to strengthen their understanding and competence in the career-oriented courses.

In addition, to provide a common intellectual experience to all students, the college designed two different inter-disciplinary integrative courses which incorporated a large number of the characteristics articu-

lated by the proponents of general education. Moreover, the 1981 changes proposed by the Curriculum Committee tightened the less structured curriculum recommended earlier by the CFC. The committee agreed that the curricular changes should be based on those intellectual experiences that would enable students to understand the complexity of the problems of the twenty-first century, to evaluate in a sophisticated and critical way the solutions that were to be proposed, and to express themselves in an intelligent and articulate manner. As a result, students chose selected courses in six different academic areas. These courses emphasized the methods, questions, and responses of key disciplines. While one cannot really separate content from the process inherent in a given discipline, the new distribution requirements placed a great deal of stress on the process in order to help the students develop skills in critical thinking. In addition, proficiency in writing, computer language, and foreign languages was required.

Once again, Goucher's most recent curricular revisions indicate an awareness and a recognition of national trends in higher education. Indeed, the College's response to these trends bridged a continual commitment to quality and excellence and concern with the changing of a new student generation. The details of these developments in curriculum, in governance, and in finances are detailed in the following pages by my colleague, Fred Musser. In the process of telling this story, he succeeds in documenting the unique place Goucher College holds in the history of American higher education.

Eli Velder, Professor of Education

A c k n o w l e d g m e n t s

*T*he writing of an institutional

history would be impossible without the help of those who, together, embody the institution, and this book has benefited from the support of trustees, administrators, staff members, faculty colleagues, students, and alumnae. I am particularly indebted to Elizabeth Conolly Todd, whose generosity provided much of the time needed to complete this project; to President Rhoda M. Dorsey, who invited me to undertake the task and then read the resulting text, guiding and supporting me throughout; and to Alma Elizabeth Nugent, whose critical comments based on multiple readings of the manuscript have left an indelible stamp on its style.

My advisory committee during the preparation of the manuscript (Sarah Dowlin Jones, Goucher's Librarian Emeritus and volunteer archivist; Genevieve Miller, Professor Emeritus of the History of Medicine at Case Western Reserve University; and Kenneth O. Walker, Professor Emeritus of History at Goucher College) read the entire text and provided incisive and invaluable comments. Miss Jones also helped unearth important material, much of it uncataloged, in the College archives.

The College librarian, Betty Ruth Kondayan, provided me with special access to the archives, and her staff—particularly Barbara Ann Simons, Stephen Hahn, and Yvonne Lev—helped me track down leads both in the Goucher collections and in other libraries. Registrar Nancy J. Englehardt and her colleagues gave generously of their time during the preparation of parts of the manuscript; David Healy, Vice President for Finance and Planning, provided needed statistics for several chapters; and A. R. MacIntyre, Director of Physical Plant Services, supplied important documents from his files.

A number of other persons read one or more chapters of the manuscript and produced valuable critical comments: President Emeritus

Otto F. Kraushaar, whose unpublished memoirs were a major source for the chapters covering the period of his administration; Deans Emeriti Dorothy Stimson and Elizabeth Geen; Dean Emeritus of Students Martha Nichols; former Chairman of the Board of Trustees Walter Sondheim, Jr.; and Director Emeritus of Admissions Mary Ross Flower. I am most particularly grateful to Professors Eli Velder and Julie Roy Jeffrey, who contributed, respectively, the Foreword and the Afterword.

The time needed to write the manuscript was greatly diminished by the generous and frequent aid provided by Larry Bielawski, director of academic computing, and his staff members Robert E. Dooley and Linda Fowble.

Many other individuals—far too many to identify specifically—contributed to the undertaking in a variety of ways; indeed, I encountered nothing but gracious assistance on the part of all to whom I turned. To those who gave so generously, my very real thanks. Collectively, you are—to borrow from President Dorsey—what makes Goucher such a grand place.

P a r t O n e



*T h e R o b e r t s o n
A d m i n i s t r a t i o n
(1 9 3 0 - 1 9 4 8)*



O N E



A Watershed Year :

1930

The purpose of this book is to bring up to date *The History of Goucher College* by Anna Heubeck Knipp and Thaddeus P. Thomas, published by Goucher College in 1938. The year was chosen not only as a publication date but as the end-point for the earlier volume because it represented the fiftieth anniversary of the opening of the College to students in September 1888. While the present study is intended to be a sequel to Knipp and Thomas's authoritative work, the year 1930, the first year of the administration of President David Allan Robertson, was clearly a watershed year, marking the beginning of a new period in the history of the College, one characterized by an administration significantly different from all previous ones. This account will therefore begin in 1930 and overlap its predecessor by eight years, though the treatment of factual detail during this period will not be entirely repetitive. It will also be necessary to glance back briefly to the Guth administration in order to contrast it with the radically different approach of President Robertson.

The announcement of the choice of Dr. David Allan Robertson in the May 26, 1930, report to the Board of Trustees by Mr. Edward L. Robinson, chairman of the committee to select a president of Goucher College, was probably received with a corporate if inaudible sigh of relief. Morale, among the students especially but also among faculty members and administrators, had been at a low ebb from 1926 to 1929 as a result of the power vacuum caused by the illness of President Guth. The election of Dr. Robertson gave promise of restoring to the institution a sense of leadership and purpose at a time when these qualities were desperately needed.¹

Since a detailed biographical sketch of President Robertson appears in Knipp and Thomas's history (pp. 323-32), only the essential outline need be repeated here.



President David A. Robertson, 1930-48

Educated at the University of Chicago, Dr. Robertson taught English there for nineteen years. He was secretary to the president from 1906 to 1920 and dean of the Colleges of Arts, Literature, and Science from 1919 to 1923. During the latter period he served as secretary of the Association of American Universities, and from 1924 to 1930 he was assistant director of the American Council on Education, with headquarters in Washington. Dr. Robertson was a voluminous writer and a respected expert on higher education. In his personality and his approach to college administration, he was the perfect antithesis to his predecessor, President William Westley Guth (1913-29).

President Guth had been a man of fierce determination, considered by many both blunt and tactless in speech and sometimes ruthless in action, but basically honest and sincere. Dean Emeritus Dorothy Stimson provides an interesting illustration. The Board of Trustees ruled on May 24, 1926, that any students who married would not be permitted to continue as students, except that, in the case of seniors, the president could bring the matter to the Executive Committee, which would make an exception if it considered it desirable to do so. (The Executive Committee repealed this regulation on May 17, 1932, allowing the president to use his discretion in the case of a student who married.) Dean Stimson observed that Guth had the unfortunate habit of "saying wise things the wrong way apropos the marriage situation. In chapel one day he said to the group that before they decided to get married, please consult him. He said it in such a way that some of the students told me later that the senior class had almost risen up and walked out on him. He was right in

telling them of the trustee ruling but he put it so badly as to arouse great feeling."²

Dr. Guth was an autocrat who enjoyed power, was never loath to exercise it, and very loath to share it. He held the reins of government firmly in his own hands, making all decisions, usually without consulting anyone. According to Judge Roszel Thomsen, former chairman of the Board of Trustees, Dr. Guth purchased the 421 acres of land in the county "with the knowledge of only one trustee."³ Mary T. McCurley, former director of Vocational Guidance Service, reports that during Dr. Guth's later years some faculty members found personal encounters with him so painful that they entered and left Goucher Hall by the St. Paul Street door to avoid passing his office.⁴

Even so, Dr. Guth placed all who have been associated with Goucher since his administration heavily in his debt. He eradicated the nearly \$1 million debt that faced the College when he took office; tripled the student enrollment, the size of the faculty, and the number of buildings; more than quadrupled the number of books in the library; increased the endowment from just under \$104,000 to just under \$2,400,000; and purchased without debt the 421 acres of Towson land that would become the present campus.⁵ These accomplishments were unprecedented in the history of the College, and, taken together, represent an extraordinary achievement by any standard.

Dr. Guth was, in short, a doer, an exceptionally effective leader to whom the College owed its survival, however abrasive his manner or rough his *modus operandi* may have been.⁶ His effectiveness collapsed, however, when he became critically ill in 1926 from an apparently undetermined disease that reduced his natural immunity and altered his personality. From this time until his death in 1929, administrative and academic business at the College came essentially to a halt. The only faculty body with power to legislate was the Board of Control, whose chairman was the ailing president, and its authority was limited to purely academic matters. It met only twice in 1927 to deal with absolutely essential business, four times in 1928 when Dr. Guth's health had temporarily improved, and then not until April 29, 1929, ten days after his death. At that point neither the Curriculum Committee nor the College Council had met for three years. And, of course, the "4-2-1 Give-or-Get-for-Goucher" campaign that was to raise money for the building of the Towson campus had never really extended beyond the alumnae. Small wonder, then, that morale was at its lowest possible ebb when Dr. Guth died in April, 1929.⁷ The situation improved the following year under two successive acting presidents, first Professor Hans Froelicher until his death in January, 1930, then Dean Dorothy Stimson until the succession of President Robertson on July 1. But only the actual presence of a new president could fully restore the spirit of the community.

The fact that President Robertson was the very antithesis of President Guth both in personality and in his approach to governance is interestingly expressed in a recent letter to the author by a Goucher graduate, Ethel Stiffler Carpenter, '22, whose college years fell entirely within the Guth administration but who attended President Robertson's inauguration. She writes that following that ceremony she was invited to the home of a very prominent older alumna for tea.

When she had served us, she settled herself very complacently in an appropriate chair and with great satisfaction announced: "At last Goucher has a president who is a *gentleman*!"

I never had the opportunity to become acquainted with Dr. Robertson. He seemed the suave diplomat who would carefully consider every move, as in a chess game. Probably he was just what Goucher needed at that time. But by stepping on toes, shoving people out of the way, crashing through obstacles, making many mistakes, did Dr. Guth do more for the college of that period than could have been achieved in any other way?

Whatever the answer to that rhetorical question may be, the fact remains that David A. Robertson represented a new presidential personality with an entirely different approach to College administration from that of his predecessor. Those who knew him describe President Robertson's personality as "shy," "aloof," "austere," and even "stuffy," but at least one colleague who worked particularly closely with him, Professor Clinton I. Winslow, described his own relations with Dr. Robertson as "warm."⁸ In any case, President Robertson was generally recognized as a brilliant scholar with a clear vision of the way the College's mode of governance and its curriculum should develop during his tenure.


Dr. Robertson was a formal but persuasive speaker and writer, and he used his powers of rhetoric effectively during his first few months in office in addresses to the Goucher community. One of his most significant early statements came in his report to the Board of Trustees on October 6, 1930. In this report he emphasized three essential areas of concern, each of which would play a major role in the evolution of the College during his administration.

First, he addressed the matter of college governance, stressing a need for "conference and cooperation" among the officers of the College, with overall administration based on "centralized control with decentralized responsibility." This clearly revealed a democratic view, contrasting sharply with the paternalistic, even monarchical, methods of previous administrations.

Second, he called attention to the need to improve financial operations, including the appointment of a business manager. (During the acting presidency of Hans Froelicher and most of that of Dorothy Stimson in 1929-30, the widow of President Guth had served as business officer. When she resigned on May 1, 1930, the trustees assigned her duties to acting president Stimson.) In connection with fiscal matters, Dr. Robertson also mentioned the importance of a published president's report and financial statement. He stressed the need to improve college publicity even though, ironically, he had withheld for financial reasons the appointment, authorized by the Board of Trustees, of a director of publicity. Most important of all, in another radical departure from past Goucher history, he recommended the establishment of a college budget.⁹

Finally, Dr. Robertson emphasized the fundamental importance of "a clear, convincing educational program," whose outgrowth would be the revolutionary curricular reform (the Goucher Plan) of 1934.¹⁰

While each of these three basic areas—governance, finance, and curriculum—affected directly or indirectly the concerns of more than one of the bodies most vitally interested in the College, namely, alum-



May Day, 1930

nae, trustees, administrators, faculty, and students, each of these five groups assigned different priorities to President Robertson's three topics. That all alumnae are by definition former students of the College and that some trustees, administrators, and faculty are also alumnae presents interesting problems of perspective for certain individuals; still, most people with such double or triple involvements probably adopt the viewpoint of whichever constituency they are most immediately concerned with at the time. All the same, there remain five distinct points of view to reconcile (not counting those of the public at large and the nonadministrative staff), and any college president confronts the special problem of having to harmonize the efforts of all these groups—which is one way a president earns a salary and, if successful, supporters. We can assess President Robertson's performance in this respect only after a detailed analysis of the problems with which he had to cope.

In general—but with many individual exceptions, no doubt—the alumnae in the thirties and forties appear to have been particularly conscious of the promise held out by President Guth for a "Greater Goucher" in the county, and of the heroic efforts the alumnae had made to raise individually \$421 as part of the unfinished "4-2-1" campaign of the twenties. As we shall see, during the Robertson administration the alumnae exerted very strong pressure on the president and the Board of Trustees to forge ahead, despite seemingly insuperable financial obstacles, with the building of the new campus in Towson. They therefore played a major role in the dramatic decisions and events that marked the middle and latter part of the Robertson era, even though the president—with good reason, considering the financial outlook—failed to mention building a new campus when he presented his initial program in 1930.

Like the alumnae, the administrators (other than the president) had their particular concerns and involvements during this period, but the

most prominently active groups were the faculty, the trustees, and the students.

A reader of, *inter alia*, the official college publications, trustee and faculty minutes, and the *Goucher College Weekly* (as the student newspaper was then called) issues of 1930–48 cannot fail to be struck by the way trustees, faculty, and students lived through this era of Goucher history largely unaware of one another's activities, each committed in its own fashion to the well-being of the institution, but with different concerns and preoccupations, all striving to achieve certain goals, and all frustrated by the same opposing forces. This explains the organization of the rest of part 1 in an attempt to recount and interpret the history of Goucher College from 1930 to 1948. The first ten years of the Robertson period seem to provide a particularly clear instance of three bodies whose aspirations were basically similar and whose frustrations stemmed from the same fundamental sources, but whose immediate preoccupations and responsibilities were, on the surface, quite different. To blend the efforts of these superficially disparate groups into a harmonious force that would, by combining different strengths, win a very difficult struggle was the task of the president.

Chapters 2, 3, and 4 will consider the concerns of the faculty, preoccupied first by governance, later by the curriculum; the trustees, primarily involved with fiscal and physical matters; and the students, affected, of course, by faculty and curriculum, but most immediately by their milieu, including their active participation in an institution that largely determined their lives for four crucial years and which later they came to regard as their alma mater.

T W O



*R e s t r u c t u r i n g
t h e C o l l e g e
(1 9 3 0 - 1 9 3 7)*

T

he Board of Control, with President Robertson's encouragement, lost little time before beginning to deliberate on the future of the College.¹ On December 18, 1930, three months after he had formally presented his program involving governance, finance, and curriculum, the president reported to the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees that the Board of Control was considering the establishment of a form of public commendation for the distinguished scholarship of freshmen, sophomores, and juniors, and departmental honors (later called special honors) for seniors, the first official recognition of academic distinction—other than Phi Beta Kappa—in the College's history. The Board of Control was also weighing the possibility of offering advanced standing by examination to students completing the work of the freshman year while enrolled in certain Baltimore public schools.² Beyond this, the board considered the whole matter of Goucher's admissions requirements and their administration, as well as the tutoring of students, the shape of the college calendar, and the organization of courses within the academic year.³

Not to be outdone by the vigorous activity of the Board of Control, the Board of Instruction began a study of the purposes of the College and of each department, a process that would later culminate in the formulation of the eight objectives, the heart of the new curriculum of 1934.⁴ The trustee Executive Committee devoted part of its March 16 meeting to making sure that this departmental labor was not in vain: the committee legitimized the existence of the departments themselves. Taking note of section 2 of the charter of Goucher College, which states that "said College may have as many departments as the Trustees shall determine," the Executive Committee voted that the following comprised the academic departments of the College: Biology, Chemistry, Economics and Sociology, Education, English, Fine Arts, German, Greek, History,

The Faculty Initiative



Lawn party, 1930s

Latin, Mathematics, Philosophy, Physical Education, Physics, Physiology and Hygiene, Political Science, Psychology, Religion, and Romance Languages. Thus, the *de facto* departments of the College became *de jure*.

Reorganization of the Faculty

On February 9, 1931, a committee on academic reorganization chaired by history Professor Eugene N. Curtis brought to the Board of Control a report containing five plans for the organization of the College. Two extreme plans, one very progressive, the other very conservative, won most of the votes, but the board divided equally between the two. After three months of meetings with no clear resolution between the opposing sides, the board invited President Robertson to express his views, and on May 20, 1931, he suggested that “we could be assured of being in the line of progress if we had a large group with established standing committees and an executive council.”⁶ This presidential endorsement carried the day for the progressive plan, which recommended new procedures for the appointment, promotion, tenure, and dismissal of faculty and advocated the creation of two new bodies, the Faculty and an executive council (later named in the by-laws “The President’s Council”) to replace the existing Boards of Instruction and Control. The



Junior-Senior Garden Party, 1934

Board of Trustees, adopting the necessary new by-laws, ratified the progressive plan on December 7, 1931.⁶

We can see how progressive the new organizational structure was by contrasting it with the past and by measuring its longevity. The Board of Control recommended, and the Board of Trustees concurred, that faculty members should be appointed by the president in consultation with the departments concerned and subject to the approval of the Board of Trustees. It also proposed that after three years of service in any rank, the reappointment of a faculty member should be "indeterminate," that is, should imply tenured status. The idea of tenure was still relatively new, and Goucher had certainly never before adhered to it.⁷ Had it done so, President Guth would have had considerable difficulty in dismissing such a popular professor as Joseph F. Shefloe (in whose honor the alumnae gave and named the College's language laboratory) and would probably not have attempted to dismiss Professor Hans Froelicher. Today, of course, tenure is all but universally accepted, though the normal qualifications for achieving tenured status are now much more complicated than Goucher's "three years in any rank" provision of 1931.

The Board of Control further recommended establishing a Dismissals Committee to hear cases involving the dismissal of tenured instructors or of any faculty members above that rank. This, too, was entirely

new at Goucher. Today the structure and functioning of the Dismissals Committee is almost identical to what the Board of Control recommended and the Board of Trustees approved in 1931, though the Dismissals Committee's original role is now partly lodged in the Grievance Committee.


Both the Board of Control and the Board of Trustees agreed that "recommendations for promotion in rank shall be made by the president after consultation with the department concerned," a procedure that differs from present practice only in the current stipulation requiring also a nondepartmental recommendation to the president from the Committee on Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure.⁸

These changes established clear principles of procedure and instituted important safeguards affecting individual faculty members which did much to improve the morale of the faculty; but of even greater significance to College governance was the adoption of by-laws abolishing the Boards of Control and Instruction and replacing them with the Faculty and the President's Council. This action amounted, in the words of Knipp and Thomas, to "an extension of the academic franchise."⁹ In reality, it was less an extension than a beginning of true faculty participation in college governance. President Robertson considered the adoption of these by-laws "the most significant action of the year" and reported on "the prompt organization of these two bodies and active work by members of the faculty in the two official bodies and in *thirty* committees of the faculty."¹⁰ Bearing in mind that the faculty of Goucher College had never before had a single standing committee, one can imagine how this new legislation changed the daily life of practically every member of the teaching staff. The Faculty (in its legislative role) and the President's Council remained the primary legislative bodies of the College until the creation of the College Assembly in 1970.

Reorganization of the Curriculum

Having reconstituted its legislative role, the Faculty proceeded to reorganize itself in terms of the curriculum. At its first meeting, on December 14, 1931, the Faculty received and approved a report from the Committee on Curriculum recommending the distribution of departments into three groups: (1) languages, literatures, and fine arts; (2) the sciences; (3) philosophical and social studies.¹¹ In 1933 the first chairmen of the three faculty groups—then called I. Humanities, II. Social Science, and III. Science—were appointed; in 1951–52 the groups changed their names to Divisions I, II, and III; and in 1955–56 they became (and remain today) Faculties I, II, and III. Their composition has varied over the years, some departments having changed their "address" (like Religion, long classified in Faculty II but now in Faculty I, and Dance, which began life as part of the Physical Education Department—itsself rather illogically housed in Faculty III, the Natural Sciences and Mathematics.¹² Dance is now an independent department appropriately lodged in Faculty I, Language, Literature, Philosophy, Religion and the Arts.)

The traditional function of the three Faculties has been to coordinate the work of related departments, sponsoring cooperation while avoiding inappropriate curricular overlap, and representing in the political arena the collective interests of their constituent departments.



Physics laboratory on the old campus

In 1932, before attacking the basic problem of overhauling the entire academic program, the Faculty dealt with several smaller but significant curricular matters. The Committee on Admissions submitted a report, adopted by the Faculty on February 2, which allowed the admission of students whose preparation was "irregular" but whose previous academic work, scholastic aptitude test, and recommendations gave evidence of the students' capacity to succeed at Goucher. The committee also recommended establishing a standing admissions committee composed of the dean, six faculty members, and the director of admissions. The new committee began work in 1933, and in 1934 the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees created the office of Director of Admissions and appointed Dr. Naomi Riches, assistant professor of history, to fill it. This relieved the registrar, Carrie Mae Probst, '04, of responsibility for admissions, a task she had coped with for many years but could no longer handle when the new curriculum of 1934 placed unaccustomed burdens on her office.

The major product of the faculty's endeavors in the years 1932-34 was, however, the restructuring of the curriculum. President Robertson, addressing the faculty meeting of October 17, 1932, called attention to the efforts, begun in 1930, "to define the objectives of the College, of departments, and of individual courses. . . . We realize," he said, "that the teacher is more important than the course. If we can determine what

we want a Goucher graduate to be, we may as teachers set out to attain this end. Even though the curriculum is not the principal thing, it may be utilized as a device for helping us to achieve our purpose." The president then touched on the central issue:

The problem which confronts us now is one of general education. Our present practice is to require certain courses. The following questions naturally arise: Why do we require these courses? Are the students really getting from the courses what we intend them to get? What is the relation of each required course to our general objectives? Would some entirely different program be preferable for the accomplishment of our purpose?

He then went on to encourage the departments and committees to set aside departmental and even financial concerns and to "try for an ideal program first and then limit [it] if we are obliged to."¹³


The Faculty took him at his word. Chaired by Dr. Robertson himself, the Curriculum Committee worked tirelessly on the substance and details of the new academic program, which it brought to the Faculty in the second semester of 1933-34. During that semester the Faculty met fifteen times, a new record.¹⁴ There were five meetings in April and six in May. On May 25, 1934, President Robertson had the satisfaction of reporting to the Executive Committee of the board that on May 14 the Faculty had approved unanimously the new time schedule and had voted 55-4 in favor of the new curriculum.¹⁵

Most of the details of what came to be known as "The Goucher Plan" were not, in themselves, unique to Goucher. What marked the program as highly original and brought it national attention was the way old and new elements were combined and the way the plan was implemented.¹⁶ Its proponents hoped the plan would respond to three basic criticisms of higher education frequently voiced at the time in somewhat the following way:

1. Specific course requirements tend to be too inflexible, ignoring different levels of individual students' preparation.
2. Teaching techniques currently overemphasize the acquisition of knowledge without sufficient encouragement of independent thinking.
3. Academic accounting in terms of "credit hours" isolates individual semester courses, which are forgotten as soon as the credits have been deposited in the registrar's bank.¹⁷

The first feature of the new plan was to divide the curriculum into two parts, the lower division and the upper division. The lower division was planned to occupy primarily the first two years and to concern itself with general education. The upper division, normally the last two years, required the student to devote about half her time to a field of major concentration.

This approach differed little from the usual distribution of breadth and depth among the four undergraduate years, and there was, indeed, not too much that was innovative about the upper division concept except the requirement that students must pass six hours of comprehensive examinations in their major at the end of the senior year. Moreover, there was no total break between the two divisions: freshmen and sophomores with adequate preparation could elect upper division courses,



Goucher's float in the NRA parade, 1933

and since the major field was to occupy approximately one half of the students' time in the junior and senior years, upper classmen were free to elect lower division courses in order to explore new areas.

The lower division, however, had many innovative features, the most distinctive being the emphasis on the "eight objectives." In a statement called "Progressive Education at the College Level" broadcast over Baltimore radio station WCBM on November 6, 1935, President Robertson outlined the salient features of "The Goucher Plan":

To the question "What is college for," the answer of Goucher College is not in terms of semester hours or required courses, but in terms of the life activities of an educated American woman of today and tomorrow, in terms of realistic objectives of general education towards the attainment of which we require each student to make some progress.

These eight objectives are: (1) to establish and maintain physical and mental health, (2) to comprehend and communicate ideas in English and a foreign language, (3) to understand the scientific method in theory and application, (4) to understand the heritage of the past in its relation to the present, (5) to establish satisfying relations with individuals and with groups, (6) to utilize resources with economic and aesthetic satisfaction, (7) to enjoy literature and the other arts, (8) to appreciate religious and philosophical values.¹⁸

Reasonable progress towards the eight objectives is required by the end of the second college year.

How does this requirement differ from requirement of courses? The difference is the same as that which exists in the American Army between commands and orders. A command must be executed at once in a prescribed way. "Shoulder arms," "Forward, march," "Halt,"—these are commands. Orders are statements of objectives to be attained, with responsibility for finding ways to attain the objectives placed upon the person to whom the order is given.¹⁹



Baseball team, 1930s

A carefully selected group of guidance officers was responsible for working out with the lower division students their programs of the first two years. Each officer dealt with a relatively small number of students, having all available information concerning their background, interests, aptitude, health, and probable future needs. Each student was expected to plan her schedule, under guidance, with a view to broadening her general education and preparing herself for the series of tests, mostly administered at the end of the sophomore year, that would qualify her for advancement to the upper division. These examinations attempted to measure the students' progress toward fulfillment of the eight objectives cited by Dr. Robertson in his radio broadcast. (The working out of the objectives had been a major part of the endeavor of numerous committees over the three years prior to the adoption of the new plan.)

The students had to pass four tests in order to move to the upper division: the Sophomore General Examination, a comprehensive test involving all but the first, second, and fifth of the eight objectives, which were evaluated in other ways; a language examination certifying the student's ability to read a foreign language easily enough to use it as a tool; an essay examination measuring the student's ability to think effectively and to write clear and correct English; and a library project demonstrating her ability to use the library, organize materials, and carry out a specific piece of independent research.

In addition to completing these tests, each candidate for promotion

to the upper division had to satisfy the Records Committee that she had, through her classroom and extracurricular activities, demonstrated qualities of character appropriate to meeting a variety of life situations. (This judgment was necessarily based on subjective appraisals supplied by guidance officers, instructors, and administrators.)

The program as a whole, at least in theory, guaranteed that all students had progressed toward fulfillment of the eight objectives without any need for specific required courses, thereby meeting the first of the three general criticisms of higher education cited earlier. It also addressed the second criticism by encouraging all students, especially in the upper division, to engage in independent work; and it dealt with the third criticism by eliminating course credits except for purposes of students transferring to other institutions.

The Faculty incorporated the 1934 curriculum into a new time scheme that reduced the number of courses students took in a given year from ten to nine. The division of the year into three terms instead of two semesters allowed students to take three courses per term. Courses meeting ordinarily four times a week permitted greater concentration of effort and provided significant blocks of time for independent projects by eliminating classes on Saturday and one weekday, usually Wednesday.

The change to a three-term calendar brought about a revision in the system for awarding honors. Under the new plan, a student could elect one of her three courses per term at any point during the final two years as independent work in the upper division. If she devoted two or more such terms of independent work to a single project, she would be eligible, on recommendation of the Honors Committee, for "special honors," which replaced the former "departmental honors."

When the new plan was introduced in the fall of 1934, students could choose between it and the old plan. The majority chose the new, and the students were generally enthusiastic about it, though there were, of course, some dissenting voices: "I find I have more time to plan the awful amount of work I have to do. I feel rather like a high school girl, having classes on the same subject on consecutive days. And how I detest those eight-thirties!" And on the same theme: "I don't like the long weekends and I hate the eight-thirties and I feel like an overworked grammar school girl." Another student wrote: "I haven't enough to do and I waste all my time looking for books that aren't there. I'm bored and expect to be more bored. We have too few subjects." But at least one student found the silver lining: "I really can see no difference in the work, but I do like the way the subjects come together. It is less easy to let things slide."²⁰

A few dissenters notwithstanding, students in general showed interest in their work. On one Wednesday in the first term of 1934, approximately 550 of a total of 630 students used the library—a strong indicator. Calling attention to the improved morale the new plan had generated among students and faculty, Dean Stimson predicted an unusually high rate of return of students the following fall. She was right. In 1935 about 86 percent returned, as against 80 to 84 percent in earlier years.²¹

While faculty morale was high, at least at the outset, the initial exhilaration soon gave way to a sense of pressure as certain implications of the



Members of the class of 1931 picking daisies for the daisy chain

restructuring made themselves felt. The senior comprehensive examinations generated few problems since each department made its own test directed to majors with largely identical preparation. But the Sophomore General Examination was an entirely different kind of undertaking—an examination administered to the entire sophomore class, whose preparation (in the absence of specific required courses) was far from uniform. The large committee responsible for formulating the questions for this battery of tests was obliged to find ways of assessing general progress toward the fulfillment of objectives, using questions in the new form, that is, questions that did not (like multiple choice or true/false questions) supply or imply the correct answer, but rather ones that forced students to furnish their own evidence in support of answers expressed in their own words. Once a large group of faculty members had completed this task after countless hours of work, and the sophomores had taken the examination for the first time in 1935, the faculty used elaborate statistical procedures to assess the results, determine the validity of individual questions, and set the passing scores of the various parts and the test as a whole. Then the faculty created a similar test for the following year.²²

If the faculty members experienced heavy constraints on their time while they designed and then implemented the new curriculum, they could not place all the blame on external causes. It is true that President Robertson, in his desire to make the Faculty as fully responsible as possible for academic affairs, seemed to create standing committees with unbounded enthusiasm, but the Faculty itself emulated its leader, often disposing of unfinished business by referring it to an *ad hoc* committee. What is more, only a group of highly meticulous scholars would have devoted so much time to preparing policy statements.

For example, when the Faculty met on January 15, 1934, to consider some general principles proposed in a draft report on the upper division curriculum, that learned body proceeded, characteristically, to spend



Vingolf Hall parlor, mid-1930s

much time on style. When it finally reached an impasse on matters of language, the Faculty referred the draft report to an *ad hoc* Committee on Style, after which it finally addressed itself, as the president had originally requested, to a consideration of general principles. The sequel to this episode occurred on April 9 when, according to the minutes, "President Robertson presented the report of the committee appointed to recast the report of the Committee on Curriculum on the curriculum of the Upper Division." Needless to say, the redrafted report was then reconsidered section by section, and probably comma by comma.²³

In light of the faculty's feeling of pressure and a discussion of this problem by the Goucher chapter of the American Association of University Professors, the Faculty asked the president, in its meeting on December 14, 1935, to study the expenditure of faculty time in committee work in order to see whether the use of fewer and smaller committees and better distribution of faculty among them could not achieve the same ends as the present system. President Robertson apparently found this possible, since the number and size of committees gradually decreased over the next few years, after which, in the manner of economic cycles, they began to grow again.

While the faculty devoted an extraordinary amount of time to creating the 1934 curriculum and then coping with its implications (which involved restructuring courses and designing new ones in addition to myriad other endeavors), it was also quite active in effecting other academic innovations.

In the fall of 1931, the American Council on Education, of which President Robertson had been an assistant director before coming to Goucher, administered its psychological test to 41,000 students at 152 colleges. While this was not an event initiated by Goucher, the test exerted some influence on Goucher's first Sophomore General Examination, given in 1935, and also gave the students' morale an immediate boost: the mean score on the ACE test for all colleges was 147.37; Goucher students' mean score of 199.00 was surpassed only by Haverford, Wells, Chicago, and Dartmouth, placing the College fifth among the 152 participating institutions.²⁴

Despite this indication of its students' psychological fitness, the Faculty found itself having to deal with problems of students underprepared in English.²⁵ On February 26, 1936, President Robertson informed the Executive Committee that the College was doing interesting work in remedial reading, Goucher and Smith being pioneers among women's colleges in this effort. The same problem arose in mathematics; in the second term of 1935-36, the Mathematics Department offered remedial work as a result of a math test given to entering students that produced a wide range of scores but with the distribution curve "skewed toward the lower performance."²⁶

In 1931 Religion, Fine Arts, and Physical Education became full departments—the religion major making its debut in 1934. At its first meeting, on December 14, 1931, the Faculty created the major in fine arts and approved the first combination major, one that allowed a student to combine any two foreign languages. In that same year the Political Science Department offered, in addition to its standard major, a new

*Curricular
Developments
Independent of the
New Plan*



Goucher Hall art classroom

one with emphasis on international relations. According to Professor Clinton I. Winslow, this was the first undergraduate major in international relations in the United States, though the claim may not be entirely accurate.²⁷

Another new endeavor undertaken in the Robertson era was Goucher's first experimentation with adult education, which began in 1932–33, when the Departments of Economics, History, and English offered Friday evening classes for “women in industry.” At the same time, the College opened regular classes to part-time students “of serious purpose.”²⁸ Later, in 1941–42, as part of the war effort, the Department of Economics and Sociology offered evening courses in statistics for social workers, and the Department of Physiology and Hygiene gave an evening course in bacteriology for Health Department workers and other qualified students.

Meanwhile, the Modern Languages Department, which seemed to flounder a bit in the early thirties as it dropped and added languages and changed its name,²⁹ nonetheless reached out to touch disciplines belonging to what would later be known as Faculties II and III. As early as 1920 the Spanish section took a tentative but prophetic step away from the ivory tower when it offered a course called “Advanced Spanish Composition and Commercial Spanish,” and in 1934 the French course in phonetics included in its catalog description the statement that it used “the phonograph for ear training and exercises of imitation”—in effect, Goucher's first language laboratory and probably one of the earliest uses of technical equipment in language teaching. But the most salient example of interdisciplinary support involved the Departments of Music and Physics. When Music offered its first credit-bearing courses—a half-course in music appreciation and a half-course in music history—in 1935, it found itself supported by a physics course called “Sound, the

Physical Basis of Music," whose catalog description mentioned "mechanism of musical instruments and quality of their sound; properties of sound waves; development of musical scales; the ear's sensitivity to pitch; acoustics of auditoriums." Music added a course in elementary harmony in 1936 and became a major with a full program of courses in 1937.³⁰

The faculty at this time was experienced, in some areas distinguished, and stable; there was little turnover. The financial stringency of the period may even have driven some faculty members to greater heights than might otherwise have been achieved. In some instances faculty suffered real economic deprivation; dry promotions (promotions without a salary increase) were all too common.³¹ One distinguished member of the faculty received no salary increase from 1929 to 1946. The contribution of this group to the College during these trying years is deserving of high commendation.

While the faculty clearly dominated the years 1930–37 with its fruitful expenditure of energy, the trustees, administrators, and students were by no means inactive. On the trustee level, to be sure, the activity was largely restricted to financial retrenchment as the effects of the depression made themselves ever more apparent. The enrollment pattern for this period, when compared with income, expenditures, and the resulting surpluses or deficits year by year, suggests the problems confronting the College. Perhaps the most important step the trustees took in the early thirties was their appropriation of three hundred dollars for installing the first budget system in the College's history.³² Without this essential resource, it is doubtful that President Robertson could have kept Goucher afloat for very long.

The enrollment decline, which (as Dr. Robertson later pointed out to the Executive Committee) had actually begun before the depression, was very apparent to the faculty.³³ On December 12, 1932, the Faculty Club, an informal social group with no official status, submitted to the Faculty a report suggesting ways individual faculty members might at-

*Activities of the
Board of Trustees*



May Day, 1933



Dancers on Alumnae Day, 1931

tract new students to the College. The first consideration was, of course, not to discourage potential candidates. "Do not," the Faculty Club urged, "overwork students to such an extent that they will advise others not to come." In another suggestion, eminently practical but with slightly vulturine overtones, the club encouraged its members to "be on the watch for colleges which have to close their doors for lack of funds."³⁴

As the second of these suggestions indicates, the faculty knew well that Goucher was not alone in its plight. According to President Robertson, fewer than forty colleges and universities had balanced their 1932-33 budgets without either reducing salaries or incurring a deficit.³⁵

The Alumnae Fund had made its first annual gift to the College in 1931, but, welcome as this was, draconian measures were clearly needed. They were taken at an historic faculty meeting on April 10, 1933, during which President Robertson presented a summary of the financial status of the College, illustrated by figures on the blackboard. He refrained, however, from making any suggestion. After a brief discussion, the faculty voted unanimously to contribute to the College 10 percent of the amount budgeted for faculty salaries for 1933-34. The result of this generous action—which the faculty renewed annually for a total of four consecutive years and which was augmented by a corresponding decrease in administrative salaries—was an annual saving of approximately \$20,000.³⁶ The Board of Trustees, meeting on October 1, 1934, received a report from the treasurer showing a surplus of

\$7,439.94 in the 1933–34 budget, but without the faculty and administrative salary cut, there would have been a deficit of over \$12,000. The president acknowledged this fact and went on to say that “the College [had] touched rock bottom” and had nowhere to go but up. Alas, he was wrong. Enrollment, which determines income from tuition and fees, a very large proportion of the operating budget of the institution, did not climb back to the 1927–28 figure of 1,060 until very much later and, indeed, did not surpass the 1930 figure of 894 until 1962. The size of the student body dropped to the nadir in 1942, when the first term enrollment was 492 as compared with 576 the year before.³⁷

At the Executive Committee meeting of September 27, 1934, the trustees decided to celebrate, in 1938, the fiftieth anniversary of the College. To those who participated in the centennial celebration in 1985, the choice of 1938 may seem odd, but there are several possible dates which one could assign to the beginning of Goucher College. While the actual founding took place in 1885, the College first opened its doors to students and began its academic program in 1888, thereby justifying the 1938 commemoration. There may have been another reason for choosing 1938 as the anniversary date: the trustees probably did not feel in the appropriate mood to celebrate *anything* in 1935.

President Robertson presented to the Executive Committee in May, 1936, a report on his program for development of the Towson campus. He concluded his report with the following words:

In summary, it is desirable to undertake, beginning in the year 1935–36, raising funds to provide for the following:

Architect’s plan for buildings and grounds

Residence halls at Towson

Library five year plan

Laboratories

Improvement in instruction

Deficit

It is desirable to complete as much of this program as possible in time to permit cornerstone layings or dedications of buildings on the Towson campus in November 1938, as part of the celebration of the 50th Anniversary of the Opening of the College.³⁸

The optimism implicit in this program for a new campus must have been dampened when the trustees received, on June 2, 1936, the melancholy news that the budget for 1936–37, based on an enrollment of 660 students, included a planned deficit of \$10,368. Even this was contingent on the faculty’s continuing its contribution of 10 percent of salary, without which the deficit would increase by an additional \$20,000. By the following June, however, the financial outlook brightened considerably, and Dr. Robertson found it possible to report to the board that the 1936–37 budget would realize a surplus of approximately \$3,000. For the first time in four years, the balanced budget for 1937–38 omitted the faculty contribution of 10 percent of salary and included an item of \$6,000, to be continued for the next four years, providing for the amortization of the \$30,000 accumulated deficit.³⁹

At the opening convocation in 1937, Dr. Robertson announced the appointment of a "Faculty Committee on Promotion whose duty is the formulation of the educational program to be expressed in architecture."⁴⁰ He also said that an advisory board of three distinguished architects had been chosen to work with the faculty committee on the site plan for the Towson campus.⁴¹ The trustees hired Tamblyn and Brown as consultants to plan the campaign that they hoped would raise the funds to move the campus from downtown to the county, using the coming semicentennial as a spur to encourage giving.⁴²

The year 1937 also marked the close of an era in the physical education of Goucher students. When Bennett Hall first opened in 1889, it was generally considered to be the finest gymnasium for women in the world.⁴³ The physical education staff had all been imported from Sweden, and with them came thirty-seven costly Zander machines. These machines, which bore a marked resemblance to the electric chair, were designed to develop appropriate muscles with "modern" scientific precision. In 1937 the Zander machines were almost fifty years old, and Miss Eline von Borries, then director of physical education, decided that there were less cumbersome and more efficient ways to accomplish the purpose they had been designed to serve. Accordingly, on October 5, 1937, the Executive Committee of the Board voted to authorize the sale of the Zander machines for scrap iron, no one apparently having thought of offering one to the Smithsonian Institution.⁴⁴

The Student Scene

While the faculty labored over the ramifications of the new curriculum and the trustees pondered the move to Towson, the students lived their own lives, touched only indirectly by these weighty matters.

The year 1930 brought significant changes in student life as well as in that of the faculty. The College abolished the freshman skullcap and hazing, and the junior class was made responsible for freshman orientation.⁴⁵ The *Goucher College Weekly* opened 1930 with a solid endorsement of the first woman to occupy the president's office at the College. After Professor Hans Froelicher's death in January, 1930, the Board of Trustees appointed Dean Dorothy Stimson as acting president, and on February 13, *Weekly* made its own position clear in an editorial. "The press," it said, "has had much to say about the novelty of a woman president. We have no doubts."⁴⁶

The tone of *Weekly* in the early thirties was relatively uniform. The writers were, for the most part, highly literate, though often far more subjective and even overtly emotional than sound journalistic practice normally permits. The reporting was, from a student viewpoint, quite extensive, including not only campus news but also a summary of world news in each issue. For a time, *Weekly* presented a retrospective column of quotations from one of its editions published ten years earlier. Each issue contained book, theatre, and music reviews, as well as full reports on Goucher events. Fully half the articles in most issues had to do with talks: chapel talks especially, but also guest lectures, club talks by faculty and others, presidential talks, readings by Professor Winslow and Dean Stimson, all reviewed with copious use of emotional adjectives—"charming," "heartwarming," "thrilling," and the like.

Every week under the heading "The Lighted House," the paper pub-




Boat Ride Day, 1930s

lished President and Mrs. Robertson's full calendar of activities. The Robertsons' social life was, to say the least, intense. When not traveling, Mrs. Robertson hosted a series of celebrities whom she brought to the College in a steady parade. The guest list at the President's House constituted a veritable "Who's Who" of the thirties, and students and faculty were regularly invited to meet these distinguished visitors. A college servant stood at the door during Mrs. Robertson's receptions and clicked a counter as each guest entered. No regular college activities could be scheduled during her "at homes" because the faculty was required to "flutter" among the guests.⁴⁷

Weekly's editorials at this time were generally conservative. While they favored discarding traditions that had lost their *raison d'être* and become perfunctory, they encouraged the retention and upgrading of sound traditions, particularly Chapel. Some students urged the institution of new "traditions," like the rather daring and innovative one of flying home for vacation. In the March 19, 1931, issue of *Weekly*, an enterprising undergraduate informed her peers that "Goucher students are beginning to solve the speed problem," the solution being "airplane travel." According to this young entrepreneuse, the speeds and rates shown in table 1 were available on the Ludlington Airplane Line.

"The trips," the student writer assured her readers, "are made in planes containing 'all modern improvements'—comfortable leather-lined chairs and a system of cabinet heating en route."⁴⁸ When Amelia Earhart visited the Robertsons several years later and spoke at the Lyric Theatre on "Adventures in Flying," she probably did not realize that she was, in some instances, addressing young experts in the field.

In 1932 the students, supported by *Weekly's* editorial page, sought to bring about another innovation: the students requested permission to have radios in their rooms.⁴⁹ The College, with its usual circumspec-



Bridge over Donnybrook, 1934

tion, replied that it would first have to study the question of electrical overload on the power house.

One innovation did materialize, however: in 1932 the Glee Club sang a concert for the first time with *men*. And in 1934 an admirable tradition was maintained: the Goucher debate team enjoyed its fifth consecutive win over the Princeton team.⁵⁰

The student newspaper did not overlook the fact that 1932 was a presidential election year. On April 23 *Weekly* reported that at a “non-partisan model national convention” at Goucher, the adopted platform was conservative, stressing “government *for*, rather than *by*, the people.” Hoover won the presidential nomination over Roosevelt by 65

Table 1 Speeds and Rates on
Ludington Airplane Line, 1931

Baltimore to	Hours Minutes	One-Way	Round-Trip
Washington	25	\$ 4.00	—
Philadelphia	50	8.00	—
New York City	1 25	13.25	\$20.00
Boston	4 00	29.10	51.70
Pittsburgh	2 05	19.20	—
Chicago	6 15	48.75	—

Source: *Goucher College Weekly*, May 19, 1931.

votes (150–85), Norman Thomas placing third with 24 votes. When a mock election, in which three quarters of the student body voted, was held in November, the student vote was similar, Hoover receiving 259 of a total of 470 student votes (55.1 percent, down from 57.9 percent in April). Roosevelt garnered 143 votes (30.4 percent, down from 32.8 percent at the model convention), and Thomas won 68 votes (14.5 percent, up from 9.3 percent seven weeks earlier).⁵¹

This time, however, the faculty voted separately, with rather surprising results. Of 53 faculty votes, Hoover won 26, Thomas 22, and Roosevelt a paltry 5.⁵² The fact that Hoover picked up one less than a majority was fairly predictable since the faculty had voted Republican in the 1922 and 1928 mock elections. That Thomas took 42 percent of the vote to Roosevelt's 9 percent is striking. This probably reflected the influence of a group of ardent faculty supporters of the Socialist party. History Professor Naomi Riches, a strong partisan who later ran for office on the Socialist ticket, may have converted a fair number of her colleagues, but the fact that Emma Thomas, Norman Thomas's sister, was an alumna living in Baltimore and well known to members of the faculty, together with the strong influence of Professor of philosophy Gertrude Bussey, an outspoken Socialist, probably had an even greater effect.

In 1933 several changes were made in student living arrangements. For the first time, the College permitted local students to live in the residence halls; the declining enrollment had clearly resulted in unused space in the dormitories. The College also put faculty members in charge of some of the residence halls, and Foster House became Goucher's first cooperative house, that is, a house in which student residents are responsible for all housekeeping, including the purchasing and cooking of food. The Infirmary Auxiliary was organized in 1933, and, of even greater concern to the students, the College opened a recreation hall to which men were periodically admitted.

The increasing appearance of men on the Goucher scene was probably the most notable change in student life in the early thirties. The first Glee Club concert with men has already been mentioned; in 1933 Goucher also permitted men, for the first time, to play the male roles in College plays.⁵³ Prior to 1908 men had not been allowed even in the audiences of College dramatic productions; then only the fathers of seniors could attend.

At least one aspect of student life did not change in the thirties and has not changed since: on January 16, 1933, the Faculty received a report about student complaints concerning food in the residence halls. Specifically, the students objected to (1) the selection of foods; (2) the cooking of foods; and (3) the serving of foods—which seems to have left little room for approbation. The Faculty, on the other hand, was less concerned about food than about drink. In 1933 the College Council raised the question of "problems incidental to repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment." Some students had requested rules about what could and could not be done. President Robertson, who preferred general principles to rules, persuaded the Faculty to take no action while awaiting a possible initiative by the Students' Organization.⁵⁴

A rather surprising initiative emerged from another student group, as a bemused Faculty discovered on December 14, 1935, when it learned

that the Pan-Hellenic Council, representing the Goucher "fraternities," had turned over to the library a collection of examination papers drawn from the sororities' accumulated files.⁵⁵ The Faculty surmised that the Council had taken this step partly as a result of faculty comment on the special privileges afforded sorority members through their possession of past examination papers. The Faculty thought it unwise to respond directly to this gesture, but it voted to authorize and request the library to make these papers available to all students and to empower the librarian to write a letter to the Pan-Hellenic Council acknowledging "this gracious gift" and offering to receive any further similar contributions the organization might be moved to make in the future.

Whether it was a question of the increased presence of men on the Goucher scene, the consequences of the repeal of Prohibition, or the unfair advantage of "fraternity" members because of their examination files, the niceties of student behavior were a major source of comment and debate in the pages of *Weekly* throughout the thirties. The Tone Committee, which was responsible for protecting the students' image from any possible blemish, was taken very seriously by students in general and by *Weekly* in particular. When, for example, the question was raised (and vehemently debated) whether the College should establish a date bureau, *Weekly* took the view that such an institution would be decidedly contrary to "tone."⁵⁶

Conservative though the student body was at this time, it did join the Democratic bandwagon in the presidential election of 1936. When 536 of a possible 677 students voted in Goucher's mock election, Roosevelt won with 281 votes; Landon received 261, Thomas 55, and Browder 5, with one vote going to Lemke.⁵⁷

The size of the turnout for the mock election was symptomatic of the seriousness of the student body in the thirties about issues, major and minor.⁵⁸ *Weekly* was very earnest about "tone," about the quality of the College and the students' own academic achievements, about the much talked about "talks" by the faculty and others, about faculty travels and the state of the world (the Sino-Japanese War, the Spanish Civil War, the German threat, peace strikes) and, of course, about the quality and "national reputation" of *Weekly* itself.⁵⁹

The paper's own tone was predominantly solemn and uplifting, though there was also evidence of more characteristically undergraduate preoccupations concerning such matters as who went where on the preceding weekend (since Saturday classes no longer existed), what the most popular dances were ("swing" was a major topic of discussion), how "Cupid" had struck certain recent graduates, and what was taking place on other college campuses. A faint trace of leftover Victorian sentimentality—as controlled as possible—occasionally revealed itself under the usually intellectual patina that clothed lengthy discussions of the problem of "gaiety" on the one hand and "tone" on the other. But soon the students would have an even more pressing preoccupation to debate: the forthcoming move to "Greater Goucher" in Towson.

T H R E E



The Beginning of “Greater Goucher” (1938 – 1942)

T

he Goucher odyssey, when the College moved from downtown Baltimore to “Greater Goucher”—the future Towson campus—began, symbolically, with the 1937 appointment of an Advisory Board of Architects to assist the Faculty in working out a plan for the new site. Before this the new campus had been constantly envisaged in terms of gothic spires; an early drawing of an architect’s conception of the campus showed rank upon rank of imposing gothic structures, and Dr. J. M. Beatty, Jr., in “The Builders of Greater Goucher,” described:

The joy of seeing visions realized,
The thrill of glimpsing through these mellowed oaks
White spires of august learning.¹


Later, in his final tribute to President Guth, “In Memoriam,” Dr. Beatty concluded the poem with the lines:

His task at noontide was but just begun—
We cannot fail him now: his spires shall rise.²

This conception of a gothic campus in Towson persisted at least from 1921 to the end of the Guth era, but Dean Dorothy Stimson cast new light on the matter in an oral interview conducted by Professor Clinton I. Winslow on March 18, 1971.³ Speaking of her first meeting with President Guth in September 1921 Dean Stimson said:

At that time on his desk was a small piece of tracing paper, outlined on it the 421 acres of the Towson campus which had been purchased the preceding spring. We spoke about the campus a little, and he commented that he hoped to have as architect Bertram Grosvenor Goodhue, who was a notable architect doing, I think, the Lincoln Memorial in Washington; I’m not quite sure. He expected to have him do it in the most modern style of building because he

*The Fiftieth
Anniversary
Campaign and
Building Plans*



"The Spirit of Goucher," 1926

did not want pedagogical gothic on the campus. Actually, the talk about spires' effect on the campus to be heard about a good deal later on was pure façade from President Guth's point of view, as he had his mind made up.

Dean Stimson's assurance notwithstanding, Dr. Guth may, in fact, have changed his mind. He did employ Bertram Goodhue to design a campus, but Mr. Goodhue died in 1924. President Guth next turned to Woldemar H. Ritter, a Boston architect, who drew the 1926 sketch showing the Gothic buildings alluded to earlier. This drawing by an architect famous for his neo-gothic buildings was printed in the Baltimore *Evening Sun* on June 8, 1926. The accompanying article makes it clear that while the sketch was "a mere suggestion," it was Mr. Ritter's intention to follow its main lines in the actual plans for the campus.

Though President Robertson had spoken frequently about the future move to Towson, he was faced with the financial realities of the depression, including its effects on fund-raising. However, he received strong alumnae support for the move. In the words of Knipp and Thomas:

The alumnae, with a few individual exceptions, have always been enthusiastic about the removal of the College to the Towson site. The Alumnae Council meeting of 1935 came to an end with the annual dinner of President and Mrs. Robertson. . . . After the dinner, President Robertson asked the alumnae some questions about building the College on the Towson campus, among them: "What would the Alumnae Council advise the Trustees to do in regard to a promotional program?" The answer came in the form of a motion, enthusiastically adopted by the group: "The members of the Alumnae Council of 1935 ask the Trustees as a part of the Fiftieth Anniversary to

formulate definite practical plans for the removal of the College to the campus and to develop them as far as possible by 1938."⁴

The Alumnae Council's motion was not really responsive, in a literal sense, to Dr. Robertson's question. He had asked for the Council's recommendation concerning a fund-raising campaign. They replied by asking the trustees to make "practical plans," but they said nothing specific about financial support of those plans, unless one interprets the word "practical" to imply such support. In truth, the alumnae, who had already made heroic efforts in the twenties on behalf of the "4-2-1" campaign, continued to contribute significantly to the Goucher building fund by raising about 60 percent of the money needed to construct the academic building later named Van Meter Hall.


Before it complied with the Alumnae Council's motion by taking the first practical steps toward building a new campus, the Board of Trustees underwent major internal changes. Mr. Elmore B. Jeffery, a president of the board for whom Jeffery House is named, died in 1929 and was succeeded by Mr. Edward L. Robinson. Though Mr. Robinson—for whose first wife the College also named a residential house—declined the presidency because of his age, he filled the role of acting president until 1936 when two remarkable men were elected to office: Mr. (later Judge) Emory H. Niles as president and Mr. John W. Sherwood as vice president.⁵

It seems odd that, to date, nothing on the Towson campus has been named for Judge Niles, who, with President Robertson and Professor Winslow, played a crucial role in launching its construction. Indeed, Judge Niles and Professor Winslow are two of the least celebrated "heroes" of Goucher history. Eleanor Diggs Corner, an outstanding president of the Alumnae Association, said: "I give [Judge Niles] all credit" for the decision to move to Towson,⁶ and Dean Stimson spoke eloquently on the role of Winslow:

This College, to my mind, is a result of the life work of Clinton Winslow. And I sometimes wonder if it has been fully appreciated. . . . To my mind, he has done an amazing job. . . . But I also know that one or two of the presidents had not understood fully what he had done and had questioned why he hadn't produced academically; and I was very glad to be able to step firmly on that idea. I can say that I knew by personal experience what he had done and what he had given up in order to do it. And I would wish very much that it is perfectly clear on the record somewhere that this College in a way is a monument to Mr. Winslow. He brought it to life.⁷

On December 23, 1936, a month after taking office, Emory Niles and John Sherwood joined President Robertson in seeking counsel from a committee of the American Institute of Architects on how to proceed with planning the new campus. The committee suggested that the College create an Advisory Board of Architects and, as we have seen, President Robertson announced the appointment of this board—together with that of the Faculty Committee on Planning chaired by Professor Winslow—at the opening convocation of 1937.

The Faculty Planning Committee and the Advisory Board of Architects decided to select an architect by national competition. Each entrant would submit a general plan for the campus and the design of one principal building. Announced in the spring of 1938, the competition



Fiftieth Anniversary Banquet, Lord Baltimore Hotel, October 1938

drew more than 150 applicants, 50 of whom were invited to submit designs.⁸ In October 1938 the advisory board recommended to the Board of Trustees that it award first prize in the competition to Messrs. Moore and Hutchins of New York City.⁹ The timing of the decision was perfect.

The trustees had planned in 1934 to observe "in a simple way" the 1884 decision of the Baltimore Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church to found "a Female College," to mark quietly in 1935 the legal incorporation of the College, and in 1936 the laying of the cornerstone of Goucher Hall, but they reserved the formal celebration until 1938, "when the half century of work with the students could be commemorated."¹⁰ The College designated October 14–16, 1938, for the fiftieth anniversary festivities, with the ceremony at the Lyric on October 14 the principal event. Though in its previous history it had conferred only ten honorary degrees, Goucher awarded honorary degrees to eight women at this gathering, and the president announced the winners of the architectural competition.¹¹ Messrs. Moore and Hutchins were awarded \$2,500; the second prize of \$2,000 was won by Eliel and Eero Saarinen; the third prize of \$1,500 went to Frost and Frost; and Thompson, Holmes, and Converse garnered the \$1,000 fourth prize.

In February 1939 Mr. (later Judge) Roszel C. Thomsen, chairman of

the Building Fund Committee, said that the first step in the move to Towson was "the building of residence halls and the necessary provision for their service. According to the present plan," he explained, "the residence halls are to consist of four houses, each accommodating about forty students, with a central unit containing reception hall, dining room, kitchen, and provision for faculty persons in residence. The cost will be about \$3,000 per student, approximately \$120,000 for each House, or \$480,000 for a Hall. Each of the Houses as well as the Hall," he discreetly suggested, "may be named for a donor."¹²

The goal of the campaign was to raise \$1,775,000, first by approaching prospective major donors as early as possible in 1939, then turning to the alumnae in the fall and winter, and concluding with Baltimore, where the trustees hoped to obtain over half their goal, in the winter and spring of 1940. In the optimistic words of the chairman of the committee, "If by Commencement 1939 half a million can be secured, it is hoped by May 1940 to secure the full sum."¹³ The hope was not fulfilled.

In June Mr. Thomsen told the Executive Committee that "the work had proceeded slowly and with results much less satisfactory than had been hoped for. All but two of the trustees had made gifts," he said, "but the aggregate is only about \$50,000." According to the minutes:

Despite the discouragement in not obtaining large gifts from the trustees and a small outside group, the members of the [Building Fund] Committee were unanimously of the opinion that the plan must continue to be pushed. The dormitory situation is so bad that, at all costs, to preserve the standing of the College, residence halls must be erected at the earliest possible time on the campus.¹⁴

Even by the following November, long after the 1939 Commencement, only \$113,417 had been contributed to the building fund as a result of the campaign, a far cry from the anticipated half-million dollars.¹⁵

The College did receive both moral and financial support from Baltimore alumnae of other women's colleges. In February 1940 Baltimore alumnae of Smith, Wellesley, Vassar, Sweet Briar, Wells, Wilson, Mount Holyoke, and Radcliffe united to give a Benefit for the Goucher building fund. This event, which featured a trio from the Philadelphia Orchestra, took place in Catherine Hooper Hall.¹⁶

At the same meeting in which it learned of the Benefit, the Executive Committee, with exemplary foresight, "viewed with favor" another source of potential revenue—the first-class commercial development of the Towson Corner, a site at the intersection of Joppa, Dulaney Valley, and York roads which the College owned. The property is now occupied by Hutzler's store and parking facility, Hecht's store, and the Towson-town Shopping Center and its parking area.

Meanwhile, planning for "Greater Goucher" continued. Although the campaign had raised only \$233,019.18 by mid-February 1940,¹⁷ on February 21 the College signed a design contract with Moore and Hutchins for the first residence hall in Towson.¹⁸ Late in May the Board of Trustees held an emergency meeting to decide whether to begin construction in Towson with \$317,217.15 pledged by 3,369 subscribers and \$127,000 already donated in cash.¹⁹ The Board recognized that the



Fiftieth Anniversary
Banquet fashion show.
Old and new gym suits,
October 1938



Daisy chain, 1940

war in Europe was likely to cause a substantial rise in building costs, although there was no certainty that the United States would enter the war. Unable to reach a decision, the trustees voted to postpone the question for a week. When they met again on June 4, 1940, President Robertson spoke fervently in favor of going ahead with construction, emphasizing that the trustees had already committed themselves. If the work did not go forward, he warned, “the morale of the College [will be] all shot to pieces.” Heeding his words, the board voted to proceed with the building of the first residence hall.²⁰

When Moore and Hutchins drew up a plan with several variations, the trustees initially favored one costing \$650,000 that called for a building with five units: a central section and four wings to house about 160 students.²¹ Later, when no practical plan for raising that sum had been proposed, and the opening enrollment for 1940–41 was 583, 4.1 percent less than the previous year, the architects proposed retaining the central unit and two wings, to accommodate one hundred students at the more modest cost of \$400,000. Moreover, adding the other wings would be possible when enrollments warranted and funds became available. Obviously pleased with this compromise, the Executive Committee unanimously approved this plan.²²

Student Preoccupations

Although students were certainly interested in the progress of the developing Towson campus—at least to the extent that they were aware of it—some of them had their sights set on academic surroundings much farther removed from Baltimore than Towson. In 1938 the College offered them a major curricular opportunity: the chance to study abroad on an approved program. On April 8, 1938, *Weekly* reported that students might study in Geneva on a plan developed by the Univer-



Group of students playing cards, 1937–38

sity of Delaware. Although this possibility was short-lived because of the impending war, it reappeared in 1948 when Sweet Briar College took over the Delaware program, which had been moved to Paris.


In 1939 students were heavily involved in the Equal Rights Council, active on campus primarily because of Professor Esther Crane's attendance at the Lima Pan-American Conference where equal rights for women was a prominent issue.²³ Numerous symposia on neutrality took place in September and October, and the *Weekly* of October 27, 1939, was already discussing the propriety of Roosevelt's candidacy for a third term as president of the United States. But there was still time for fun. On May 26, 1938, the students held the first May Ball featuring the first Big Band to appear at the College.²⁴

Although undergraduate concerns in 1940 focused largely on national and international affairs, two major campus issues caught students' attention. In 1940 *Kalends*, Goucher's fifty-year-old student literary magazine, was replaced by a new periodical, the *Dilettante*; and in a forceful editorial in its issue of February 9 *Weekly*, always interested in governance, urged the revival of College Council, which had lain dormant for a year and a half. The editors further suggested the possibility of having "student representatives on at least some committees of the faculty" such as the Planning and Library Committees and especially the Committee on Student Life.²⁵

In a broader perspective *Weekly* began the year by highlighting a series of war symposia at which various speakers discussed aspects of the international situation,²⁶ and in September 1940 a significant source of debate in the student newspaper was the question of national conscription. In October—which also saw the appearance of a regular humorous article appearing in column 5 of the editorial page under the highly appropriate heading "Fifth Column"—the newspaper conducted one of its most elaborate preelection surveys. Readers were asked



Hockey game, 1942



Downtown dining room, mid-1940s

Table 2 Goucher College Weekly Pre-election Survey, October 1940

*Beginning of
"Greater Goucher"*

<i>Presidential Preference</i>		
Candidate	Student Vote	Faculty Vote
Willkie	187	21
Roosevelt	159	10
Thomas	4	4
Browder	1	0
<i>Attitude toward Selective Service Act</i>		
Favor Selective Service Act	302	23
Oppose Selective Service Act	350	11
<i>Preferred Objective of U.S. National Defense Policy</i>		
	Student Preference	Faculty Preference
Defense of U.S. within its own territorial limits	116	8
Defense of Western Hemisphere	170	17
Maintenance of World Order	63	8

Source: *Goucher College Weekly*, October 25, 1940.

to vote for a presidential candidate, for or against the Selective Service Act, and for one of three directions the government's policy of national defense might take. The results of the survey are shown in table 2.

When the College began the second term in January 1941, the enrollment of 576 showed a decline from 583 at the start of the first semester.²⁷ This decrease suggested retrenchment of faculty positions in areas that attracted the fewest students²⁸ and led to an event in February 1941 that foreshadowed a similar occurrence in the seventies. The Executive Committee terminated the position of Dr. Herbert Shaumann because of low enrollments in German, and reduced to part-time the position of Dr. Grace Beardsley because of low enrollments in classics.²⁹

Balancing such efforts to decrease expenditures, at the same meeting the Executive Committee took steps to increase income by establishing the Goucher College Fund, a committee charged with planning and overseeing activities involving fund-raising. The Executive Committee also voted to approve the appointment of a financial vice president whose responsibility would be "to spend his time on such financial activities as authorized by the Goucher College Fund." The first appointee to this position, the College's first vice president, was Mr. Horatio Whitridge Turner.

At the next meeting of the Executive Committee, the president reported on the duties of the new vice president, namely, "fund-raising and publicity connected therewith"; Mr. Turner was to give his immediate attention to the "solicitation of gifts and development of a bequest program related thereto." And in a major step the committee voted to award a contract "for the erection of Residence Hall No. 1 at a cost of \$377,000.00" to the Harry Hudgins Co.³⁰ Excavation for the first dormitory on the Towson campus, the future Mary Fisher Hall, began on April 8 with the cornerstone laying scheduled for the 1941 Commencement.³¹

Endowment funds present a serious difficulty. As a rule, they can be

*The Final Months
before the War*



Student in auto repair course offered as part of National Defense Program, early 1940s

used only to generate income; while such income is expendable endowment, the principal is not. The Board of Trustees found a way to circumvent this problem in connection with the building of the new residence halls on the Towson campus. They reasoned that, since the investment portfolio was generating approximately 2 percent interest, the trustees could fulfill their obligation to raise as much income as prudently possible by investing some of the College's endowment in dormitories that would realize a higher rate of return. Acting on this theory, Mr. Roszel C. Thomsen and Mr. Frederick W. Brune, counsels for the Committee on Investment in Income-Producing Dormitories, petitioned Circuit Court No. 2 of Baltimore City for instruction to the trustees as to their duties and for authorization to sell present security holdings for reinvestment in income-producing dormitories. On June 7, 1941, Judge Eli Frank signed a decree empowering the Board of Trustees "to invest the endowment funds of the College in the erection of income-producing residence halls or dormitories, subject to amortization at not less than 2 percent per annum, so that the entire amount invested may be returned to the endowment fund in cash within the estimated useful life of the buildings."³² In a foresighted move on May 15, 1941, the board had passed a resolution that, subject to the Court's approval, amounts not to exceed \$750,000 be invested in the residence hall currently under construction.³³ Having already reached this crucial decision, the board voted unanimously to accept the Harry A. Hudgins Company's bid of \$191,498 for the erection of Houses A and B.³⁴

On August 29 the College sold Foster House to the Building Congress of Baltimore for \$7,250, thereby beginning a long process of liquidating the downtown property.³⁵ A month later the Executive Commit-

tee gave responsibility for the interior decoration of Residence Hall No. 1 (except for the student bedrooms) to Moore and Hutchins.³⁶ The next step in preparing the new campus for occupancy involved a fascinating detail. In December when the College negotiated the appointment of a landscape architect for the Towson campus, the choice to fill this position fell upon a gentleman with the most appropriate name imaginable: Mr. H. Clay Primrose.³⁷

As construction went forward, the College community was first elated, then saddened, by other events. On September 9, 1941, the Executive Committee of the Board received the happy news that Professor Ola Winslow's study of Jonathan Edwards had won the Pulitzer Prize for the best biography of 1940,³⁸ but on October 31 *Weekly* informed the College that President and Mrs. Robertson had been hospitalized for injuries suffered in an automobile accident, Mrs. Robertson with a "mild concussion" and President Robertson with lacerations and bruises of the face and one knee. President Robertson's injuries proved moderate, but Anne Knobel Robertson died on November 4, 1941.

Through the years leading up to the United States' entry into the war, the students, like the rest of the Goucher community, had been following events on the international scene, debating their significance and participating in them as best they could. In January 1941 the Students' Organization authorized a new campus group: The Goucher Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies.³⁹ The following October the Goucher Defense Organization came into being, its purpose (in addition to lobbying in Washington) to promote such humanitarian activities as Bundles for Britain and voluntary service with the USO.⁴⁰ In November *Weekly* announced the formation of a National Service Program, divided into five parts: (1) education, including such courses as first-aid, emergency nursing, recreational leadership, occupational therapy, life-saving, and elementary nutrition; (2) production, which involved knitting sweaters, socks, and mittens and sewing garments for the American Red Cross; (3) fund-raising for contributions for the home services and to equip a rehabilitation project and recreation center in England for children still in London; (4) conservation of oil and electricity and collection of tin foil, clothing and books; and (5) publicity intended to awaken a college-wide interest in the program.⁴¹

*Goucher's Response
to the War*

On December 7, 1941, the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, and on December 8 the United States entered the war. Three days later, Judge Niles presented to the Executive Committee the following resolutions, which were adopted unanimously:

1. Resolved that the President of the College be authorized and directed to draft and send a declaration of loyalty and support on behalf of the College to the President of the United States, the Governor of the State of Maryland, and the Mayor of Baltimore City, and to tender to them all the service within our power.
2. Resolved that the President, Faculty and students be urged to discover, consider, and put into effect all means by which Goucher College is especially or uniquely qualified to assist in the present National Emergency whether by instruction, personal services or the

use of the plant and facilities of the College as an institution under private control, unrestricted by Governmental restrictions.⁴²

President Robertson then reported that air wardens had been appointed for all buildings now in use and that blackout arrangements had been put under the supervision of the chief engineer. To prepare students for the possibility of blackouts, Dr. Robertson urged, in a letter to "The Parents of Goucher Students" dated December 29, 1941, "that each student return to College, January 5, with a flashlight, a thermos bottle, warm clothes, and shoes large enough to permit the wearing of woolen socks. The College physician suggests that students, like persons going to summer camps, be inoculated against typhoid. A series of inoculations begun at home can be completed after the return to College."⁴³

By January 16, 1942, over 250 students were enrolled in such non-curricular courses as mechanical drawing and air navigation or were otherwise engaged in work sponsored by the National Service Program.⁴⁴ The United States Navy provided one very special course, taught by English Professor Ola Winslow in a room on the top floor of Goucher Hall. In 1941-42 and 1942-43 Professor Winslow recruited classes of approximately eight students each and instructed them in the art of naval cryptography. The students, most of them classics or English majors, held "Top Secret Ultra" security clearances, and at the end of the course the majority were commissioned in either the navy or the marines in ceremonies held in the chapel. In 1942-43 a second section of the course was taught by a naval officer.⁴⁵

War work occupied the minds of students and faculty alike in 1942, and one of the burning questions was whether to conduct a summer session related to national defense. In *Weekly's* January survey faculty and students voted 125 to 88 *against* having a summer session but supported, by a vote of 120 to 92, a proposal to eliminate spring vacation in order to end the year earlier than originally anticipated, thereby making more people available for defense work during the summer.⁴⁶ These votes were later confirmed by the trustees, but first the Executive Committee considered moving commencement from June 15 to June 2 or 9, with no sacrifice of teaching hours, and offering, during the summer of 1942, a number of short courses related to national defense.⁴⁷ The Faculty voted, however, not to hold a full summer term in 1942,⁴⁸ and *Weekly* announced the final decision on February 20: by abbreviating spring vacation and adding a few Saturday class days, the College would shorten third term by one week with no loss of class time.⁴⁹

As summer approached, *Weekly* increased its coverage of vacation opportunities to contribute to the war effort. One long-range possibility, a call from the U.S. Army Signal Corps for women electronic engineers, aroused interest. Any student with three and a half or four years of college education who had successfully completed a specified physics course in electricity would be eligible for training. Goucher's Physics Department announced that it would offer Physics 109 (Alternating Current Electricity) in the third term to meet the Signal Corps specifications, and that the following year it would rename the course "Electronics and Radio."

The Political Science Department inaugurated a program in 1942 that would later become a very significant part of the College's



Goucher Hall and Bennett Hall, next to the First Methodist Church, 1930s

curriculum—the off-campus internship. Three students, two in political science and one in economics, completed internships in the Office of Price Administration.⁵⁰ Interestingly, in one of his last meetings with the Executive Committee of the Board (March 29, 1948), President Robertson took pleasure in reading a letter from a member of the UNESCO staff expressing appreciation for the work of a Goucher student serving an internship in his department.⁵¹

Internships not only provide valuable experience to the student, they also contribute, in many instances, a measure of useful service to public organizations. We have seen that service was much in the minds of students and faculty during the war years, and a notable example appeared in the first of a series of publications called “Broad­sides” that the faculty initiated in January 1943. Some thought these pamphlets had possible recruitment value, but they did not directly invite recipients to come to Goucher; rather, they made general appeals to prepare for the needs of the time.⁵² “Broadside Number One” began with the following open letter, written by Eleanor Spencer, professor of fine arts, but, by Faculty vote, signed in the name of the faculty as a whole:

To the Students of Goucher College:

Since the war is now a part of your life, you need to plan your education in relation to it. Moreover, the postwar world will be, to some degree, your responsibility, for “we cannot win a true victory unless there exists in this country a large body of liberally educated citizens” (Wendell Willkie).

As educated women, you know that your responsibility and your ability



Students at an Army-Navy hockey game, 1930s

to help will increase in proportion to the quality and quantity of your training. You know that the Goucher College liberal arts program is both sound and flexible. Some of you are preparing now, within the curriculum, for specialized service in one of the sciences. The humanities and the social studies, which seem less directly connected with winning the war, are as essential as the sciences for winning a true victory. You who wish to concentrate in these fields may, by careful selection of a few courses for a definite purpose, equip yourselves to help in the present emergency as well as in the postwar period. . . .

Your decisions may involve a change of electives, acceleration, or an intensification of your training in summer schools. You have not yet been drafted for service. You will be more useful when your college work is finished. Plan, therefore, as wisely as you can, for a definite form of service after college. Remember that as college students you are guardians of the ideals of liberal education. Hold these ideals in trust until the men of your generation can return to claim their share of the obligations of educated citizens.

The Faculty of Goucher College
February, 1943⁵³

As the students and faculty began the year 1943, their spirited participation in the war effort showed no sign of abating. *Weekly* continued to remind readers of their patriotic duty to buy war bonds and stamps regularly, give books for the servicemen, and donate blood to the Red Cross.⁵⁴ For its part, the Faculty took up again the question of offering a summer term that would permit students to accelerate their studies and thereby hasten their availability for service. Although it had decided against such an undertaking the year before, the Faculty reconsidered the question in March 1943 and voted to hold a full term with a fairly substantial set of course offerings the following summer. President

Robertson informed the Faculty on April 10 that the Board of Trustees had approved the proposal; on April 16 *Weekly* announced the first summer session in Goucher history.⁵⁵

As a contribution to the College as well as to the war effort, faculty participating in the summer program volunteered to teach the extra term without salary.⁵⁶ Unfortunately, only fifty-one students enrolled in the program, and since the College would have incurred a deficit if the faculty participants had been compensated, the Faculty saw no future for the experiment and voted unanimously on November 13, 1943, to discontinue it. Bearing in mind that the sooner students graduated, the sooner they could contribute fully to national defense, the Faculty approved a proposal to relax the residence requirement so students could accelerate by taking one term of their senior year in a summer school of another institution.

Goucher's participation in the war took many forms. During the same year in which it offered its first summer program, the College made it possible for four area hospitals to provide a different kind of session using Goucher's facilities: a pre-clinical nursing program in Catherine Hooper Hall that enrolled approximately one hundred students.⁵⁷ Meanwhile, shipbuilding continued at a rapid rate, and the new ships were often named for prominent persons or institutions. Mr. John Sherwood, vice president of the Board of Trustees, proposed to the Maritime Commission that a ship be named for the College's founder.⁵⁸ On November 22, 1943, the Executive Committee received the uplifting news that the liberty ship *John F. Goucher* was to be launched the following day. History repeated itself two years later when President Robertson announced the launching, scheduled for June 2, 1945, of the *SS Goucher Victory*.⁵⁹

After the Allied victory in 1945, the College was able to return to more normal operations and gradually resume its building program, but as a result of the war, several changes took place in the composition of the student body. On January 6, 1946, the *Baltimore Sun* carried an article by Florence Murray, '43, which called attention to students who had entered Goucher the previous fall after having held war jobs for two or three years; and the following June the Faculty approved the admission of male veterans as noncandidates for the degree.⁶⁰

F O U R



The Final Years of the Robertson Administration (1941 – 1948)

Further Preparations for the Transition to Towson

By the beginning of 1941–42 the students knew that the first residence hall in Towson was scheduled to open the following September, and *Weekly* reflected a great deal of enthusiastic anticipation.¹ The College foreshadowed things to come when it placed an order for three buses in January 1942² and made plans for the construction of an infirmary facility on the ground floor of House B.³

As progress continued in Towson, President Robertson called to the trustees' attention the architects' need for names of buildings, houses, and other memorials.⁴ In February a Committee on Memorials recommended that the new residence hall in Towson be named Mary Fisher Hall in honor of Mary Cecelia Fisher Goucher, and that the four houses be named for four early women faculty members: Clara L. Bacon, Frances Mitchell Froelicher, Stella A. McCarty, and Lilian Welsh. The trustees approved unanimously the designation Mary Fisher Hall, but they returned the suggestions for house names to the committee for further consideration.⁵ As the end of the academic year approached, the trustees decided to hold the commencement ceremonies on the Towson campus in front of Mary Fisher Hall and to confer on Madame Chiang Kai-Shek, through the Chinese Ambassador, the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws.⁶ Though Madame Chiang could not—for obvious reasons—be present to receive her degree, she wrote a gracious acknowledgement, mailed in India and flown to the United States by clipper.⁷

To hold commencement in Towson for the first time was an easy decision to make; a much harder choice faced the trustees in the spring of 1942: whether or not to raise tuition and fees. The College certainly needed the increased income, but the risk of losing students who could not afford the rise in cost seriously concerned the Board. Despite the

possible adverse effects on enrollment, the Executive Committee voted to raise tuition from \$450 to \$500 and increase the maintenance fee for students in residence from \$500 to \$525.⁸

When Goucher opened for the fall term of 1942–43, students occupied Mary Fisher Hall for the first time. Because of the oil shortage, the building used coal for heating.⁹ This was not a major problem, but scheduling meals and classes on two sites and transporting students, faculty, and staff between the city and Towson caused considerable irritation. In an October 9, 1942, editorial headed “Towson Troubles,” *Weekly* took the students to task for spreading unfounded rumors and for blaming the administration for situations over which it had no control, not to mention complaining to one another rather than calling difficulties to the attention of the proper authorities who could deal with them. “Mary Fisher is new,” wrote the editor, “and its location as far as classes are concerned involves a number of complicating factors, even for normal times. But when gasoline rationing, rubber shortages, and lack of necessary workers are added to an already complex situation, the result is problems and more problems.” The best response, *Weekly* suggested, was less futile moaning and more mutual self-help.¹⁰

As *Weekly* pointed out, the difficulties involved in moving between Mary Fisher Hall and St. Paul Street were real. On September 21 President Robertson outlined steps to alleviate the problems. He noted that transportation facilities had been restricted by the Office of Defense Transportation, but four station wagons would provide free service between Mary Fisher and Towson; the establishment of a waiting room at the corner of York and Joppa Roads would offer some comfort for the commuters. Furthermore, the use of car tickets, procurable from the College, reduced the round-trip fare on the trolley to twenty-nine cents. Extra cars, he said, would leave Towson at 9:30 every class day to bring Mary Fisher Hall residents into the city in time for 10:00 classes. “In spite of the difficulties with which we are faced,” concluded the president, “we shall all try to make the year a happy one.”¹¹

The trustees successfully journeyed to Towson on October 17, 1942, where they had the pleasure of holding their first meeting in the drawing room of Mary Fisher Hall. There they learned that freshman classes in history, mathematics, and English were being taught in the building from 8:20 to 9:10 a.m.¹² The College planned to add more morning classes in the second and third terms and was developing religious and community programs for the residents.

The bad news was the enrollment, which at the beginning of the first term was 492, down from 576 at the same time in 1941. On the other hand, the amount of downtown property owned by the College had declined as well. The only residence hall still open in the city was Gimle Hall; Sessrymner had become a dining room, Goucher Hall a student center. Vanaheim, Gimle Annex, Foster House, Folkvang Hall, Trudheim Hall, Dunnock House, and Midgard had all been sold.¹³ Mardal and Hunner Houses had closed, and Fensal and Vingolf Halls had been leased to the U.S. Army, though students continued to use the land between them for hockey practice. Still in use, Alumnae Lodge was not for sale.

At that time, the College had expended \$719,591 on the Towson project, approximately \$425,000 of this from endowment funds and

\$295,000 from building campaign funds.¹⁴ Commenting to the Faculty on the situation, President Robertson observed that a substantial operating deficit in 1941-42, including the cost of the 1938 campaign, had further increased the overall debt of the College. Expenditures, he said, were being decreased wherever possible, but income from securities and student fees was dwindling even faster. The problem of controlling expenditures was exacerbated because the College was badly overstaffed. "To take care of shifts in course enrollment," the president suggested, "let us seek to utilize hitherto unexploited qualifications in members of our faculty."¹⁵

Weekly, at least, saw better things to come. In articles in the November 13 and 20 issues, the newspaper noted that with the purchase of a new thirty-three passenger bus and the scheduling of eight new courses in Towson, traveling should become easier. Furthermore, many lower-division students would now have all their courses offered on the Towson campus. So, in an optimistic spirit perhaps not fully shared by the trustees, *Weekly* predicted improved convenience for students.¹⁶

Though the war impeded construction in Towson until 1946, the trustees found at least one good use for the land: planting a crop of alfalfa in the fields bordering Dulaney Valley Road.¹⁷ Despite the enforced moratorium on major construction because of the shortages of personnel and materials, one item could be built at this time—a new gateway to the College. Situated several hundred yards north of the present one, the original entrance was really nothing more than the service road used by construction workers to gain the most direct possible access to the building site of Mary Fisher Hall. In 1943 the trustees asked Moore and Hutchins to design what they thought of as a "permanent" gateway.¹⁸ After two years of planning for the construction and landscaping of the area, Moore and Hutchins reported in November 1945 that the William W. Guth memorial gate, a gift of Mrs. Guth and the class of 1929, had been completed.¹⁹

The absence of new residence halls in Towson and the closing of old ones downtown combined with increased enrollments to cause a serious housing shortage beginning in 1944. The figure in January 1943 was still only 503, but a year and a half later, in September 1944, student enrollment passed 600 and continued to rise, reaching 739 in October 1947. This was heartening news, of course, but September 1944 found the College unprepared to house all the new students. As a result, the administration was obliged to lodge about twenty students at "the State Teachers College on York Road" (now Towson State University).²⁰ The same situation occurred in September 1945, when all residence halls were filled to capacity and twenty-one students were again quartered in Richmond Hall of the State Teachers College. That there were forty fewer city students than the year before exacerbated the problem.²¹ To avoid a third year of boarding out students, the administration explored the possibility of converting single rooms in Mary Fisher Hall to doubles, but this proved impractical. Accordingly, the College decided to turn Alheim Hall, then an academic building on the downtown campus, back into a dormitory.²²

Meanwhile, the College encountered several problems involving

travel routes to and through the Towson campus. First, difficulties arose in connection with the new entrance road. On September 17, 1945, the Executive Committee learned that the drive from Dulancy Valley Road to Mary Fisher Hall had "cracked and dropped again." The trustees voted to have "the cheapest possible patching job done to make the road practical for temporary use." A much more serious problem, also involving a thoroughfare, arose in late 1945, when the trustees learned of a plan to build a highway (the future Baltimore beltway) just north of Joppa Road. According to the original plan, this freeway would have cut through the middle of the campus. In due course, the College prevailed upon the State Roads Commission to move the proposed artery farther to the north.²³ This solved the beltway problem permanently, but the entrance road remained troublesome for some time to come.²⁴

The end of the war allowed the College to raise its sights from such minor activities as road-patching to full-scale construction on the campus. On January 21, 1946, Moore and Hutchins exhibited to the Executive Committee a completed plan for Residence Hall No. 2, the future Anna Heubeck Hall. By September the administration was engaged in intense planning with Moore and Hutchins, not only for the residence hall but also the library and a humanities building.²⁵

On December 2 Judge Niles reported to the Executive Committee, for the Committee on New Buildings, a plan to construct permanent ground floors with unfinished exteriors for both the humanities building and a science building, and to build, in similarly skeletal form, the north and west wings of Residence Hall No. 2, all to be ready for occupancy in the fall of 1947. Consideration of the library was deferred. The full board approved these decisions on December 11, 1946.²⁶

On February 3, 1947, Moore and Hutchins recommended to the Executive Committee the construction of a service road from Providence Road to the east end of Residence Hall No. 2. At the same meeting the committee heard that the Civilian Production Administration had approved the College's plans for Residence Hall No. 2 and the science and humanities buildings. Construction crews began at once to ready the three new structures,²⁷ all still in unfinished form, for occupancy when the College opened in September 1947. Accordingly, the administration announced that in the first term of 1947-48, the College would house the majority of students and offer the majority of courses on the Towson campus.²⁸

Though the laying of the three cornerstones took place on schedule at the 1947 Commencement,²⁹ when the College began the first term of 1947-48, none of the three new buildings was ready for occupancy.³⁰ Bad spring weather and severe labor shortages caused the delay and forced the College to crowd ninety-seven students into Mary Fisher Hall and city dormitories until Residence Hall No. 2 could open. Meanwhile, the administration reassigned all classes to downtown sites.³¹ The dedications of the first two completed houses of Residence Hall No. 2, Bennett House and Robinson House, took place on November 23, 1947, and the College gave the temporary name Lilian Welsh Laboratory to the basement and first floor of the science building.³² Students assigned to Bennett House moved from Mary Fisher Hall on November 22, and on November 29 Robinson House was occupied.³³ By January 15 the Department of Physiology and Hygiene had moved into the new

Lilian Welsh Laboratory, and Moore and Hutchins announced that the humanities building would be ready for students later in January.³⁴

The first four classes did, in fact, meet in the new humanities building on February 9, 1948,³⁵ and by mid-April the faculty was offering forty-seven courses in sixteen departments in the new science and humanities buildings. Eighteen faculty members and twelve administrators were also having luncheon regularly in Mary Fisher Hall, indicating that the new campus was now a very active place.³⁶ The alumnae completed the naming of existing structures when they voted to designate the humanities building in honor of the College's first dean, John Blackford Van Meter, with the further notation that the hall was "the gift of the alumnae of the College."³⁷

Moore and Hutchins, who had submitted blueprints for the library in April 1946, supplied detailed plans for construction two years later,³⁸ and although President Robertson placed the first of what eventually became three library cornerstones at commencement on June 12, 1948, his successor, President Otto F. Kraushaar, for reasons explained in chapter 6, postponed further work on the library until the College had dealt with other matters more immediately pressing.

Meanwhile, the trustees considered two other new buildings: a faculty apartment house and a president's house. On February 17, 1947, the Executive Committee discussed the possibility of a building that would contain apartments for eight to twelve faculty members but tabled the motion because eight apartments would cost \$120,000.³⁹ Though in different form, the same idea emerged the following November. The Executive Committee first considered building a small, temporary house on campus which faculty could use later when the College finally constructed a permanent president's house.⁴⁰ Ultimately, on February 9, 1948, the committee decided to buy an off-campus house for the president. Mr. Hobbs, then the vice president of the College, subsequently succeeded in purchasing the C. H. Williamson house on Joppa Road.

As the Towson campus grew, the College continued to reduce its real estate downtown, selling Bennett Hall on February 11, 1945, to the State of Maryland for \$50,000. On April 29, 1946, it sold Fensal and Vingolf Halls and the land between them to the War Department for \$134,000.⁴¹

*Off-campus
Developments
in Towson*

The trustees' concerns with Goucher land in Towson extended beyond the campus proper. As we saw earlier, the trustees had, as early as December 1930, favored the idea of developing College property for commercial purposes in the vicinity of Towson Corner. On May 20, 1946, Vice President Hobbs informed the Executive Committee that "department store interests" (that is, Mr. Albert Hutzler) wished to cooperate with Goucher in a commercial development. On June 24 Judge Niles moved approval of the negotiations undertaken to that point. Although local residents opposed the College's petition to rezone the Joppa Road property as commercial, the Zoning Commissioner granted Goucher's petition.⁴² This decision was appealed but upheld, and on June 16, 1947, the Board of Trustees announced that the College

had sold or leased pieces of property at the intersection of Joppa and Dulaney Valley Roads to Hutzler Brothers Company for a joint commercial enterprise. In July, at the College's request, the Baltimore County Zoning Commission designated an additional 100 feet of land on Joppa Road east of Dulaney Valley Road as commercial;⁴³ this property was leased in September to Hutzler Brothers.⁴⁴ The Executive Committee viewed, on December 8, a model of the proposed development of Goucher's real estate in this area, including Hutzler's department store (in its present location) with its sunken parking lot for 587 cars, a motion picture theatre, a large grocery store, and approximately forty-five small shops. So began a series of complicated negotiations leading ultimately to the present shopping center between Fairmount Avenue and Joppa Road.⁴⁵

During the forties the College received several welcomed gifts, including a \$5,000 grant from the McCormick Company to build two badly needed tennis courts and the offer of Mr. John Sherwood to donate advertising time on all his company's radio programs in Baltimore and Washington to promote a benefit, featuring Cornelia Otis Skinner, sponsored by the Baltimore Alumnae Club.⁴⁶ But a gift of \$10,000 from the Hoffberger family, to be applied to the construction of a new residence hall wing, caused some searching of conscience by several trustees because the check was drawn on the Guenther Brewing Company. The Executive Committee voted without dissent on December 28, 1943, to accept the check. The next day a motion to reconsider was introduced. After some discussion, the committee again voted to accept the check. Still, when the matter reached the full board on January 20, 1944, while eight trustees voted for acceptance, six voted against. The opponents argued that to accept money from such a source constituted a "change of policy." With President Robertson maintaining firmly that there was no definable policy relevant to the issue, the motion to accept the gift passed.⁴⁷

Gifts to the College

Shortly thereafter, on February 20, 1945, the news came to the Board of Trustees that Goucher would be the beneficiary of the Julia Rogers estate, appraised at approximately \$890,000, the largest gift to date in the College's history.⁴⁸ On February 4, 1946, the Executive Committee heard that the executor had rendered a first accounting which indicated that the residue of the estate accruing to the College would amount to approximately \$946,176.36, almost a million dollars.⁴⁹

While engaging in these activities, the administration underwent a series of changes which would lead eventually to the transition to a new presidency. First, the trustees asked Professor Clinton I. Winslow to accept the position of provost.⁵⁰ The role of promotional officer of the College apparently did not tempt Professor Winslow, who was more interested in the architectural development of the new campus. Ultimately, the trustees appointed him administrative assistant "to aid in studying the architectural needs of the College and to help secure financial means to realize plans including removal of the entire college to

Changes in Administrative Personnel

Towson.”⁵¹ Since the nature of Professor Winslow’s appointment did not fill the need for a person to handle such matters as the sale of downtown properties and the leasing of land at Towson Corner, the board created the office of Vice President (without portfolio) and elected Mr. Clark S. Hobbs, a senior editor at the Baltimore *Evening Sun*, to fill the position for the next five years.⁵² Mr. Hobbs took office on June 1, 1945, while Professor Winslow and his Faculty Planning Committee continued to prepare for the relocation of all operations and personnel from the city to Towson.

President Robertson had announced to the Executive Committee on February 7, 1944, that he and Mrs. E. L. Robinson would be married on February 14 and requested leave of absence for three weeks. The committee offered congratulations and granted the president a three-week vacation.⁵³ In October of the following year, noting the tradition he had maintained of supporting mandatory retirement at age sixty-five, President Robertson submitted his resignation to the Board of Trustees “on this, my sixty-fifth birthday.”⁵⁴ The board declined to accept his resignation and when he resubmitted it a year later, the trustees asked President Robertson to remain in office until June 30, 1948.⁵⁵ On October 21, 1946, the Executive Committee received a letter from Dr. Robertson accepting the trustees’ request that he serve until June 30, 1948, but declining on principle their offer to confer on him an honorary degree. To confer a degree on a member of one’s own institution, he said, was frowned on by the American Association of Universities, the Middle States Association, and the Committee on Qualifications of Phi Beta Kappa. Furthermore, he believed that a college whose mission was the higher education of women should confer degrees, in course and honorary, exclusively on women.

Pleased with Dr. Robertson’s willingness to continue as president until June 1948, the Board of Trustees set about the task of choosing his successor. On July 31, 1947, the Committee on the Selection of a President, which included three elected faculty members (Professors Clinton I. Winslow, Gertrude Bussey, and Eleanor Spencer), submitted to the Board the name of Dr. Otto F. Kraushaar. With Dr. Kraushaar promptly elected as the next president of Goucher College, the board, on June 14, 1948, named Dr. Robertson president emeritus. President Kraushaar took office on July 1.⁵⁶

While the board was involved with the presidential succession, several developments occurred in the deanships. On May 12, 1947, the Executive Committee changed Frances R. Conner’s title, student counselor, to dean of students. The year before, on October 7, the Executive Committee had accepted the resignation of Dorothy Stimson as dean of the College and had granted her a year’s leave of absence at half-salary, after which she was to return to the College as a full-time member of the History Department.⁵⁷ Dr. Louise Kelley, professor of chemistry, agreed to serve as acting dean during the year of Dr. Stimson’s leave. President Robertson informed the Executive Committee on January 12, 1948, that he and President-elect Kraushaar had discussed the deanship of the College and had approached Dr. Eleanor Spencer, professor of fine arts, but she had declined. Subsequently, Dr. Kelley consented to continue as acting dean for a second year.⁵⁸

Apart from the perennial problems of fund-raising and bricks and mortar, the trustees and the administration had, as usual, a variety of other matters to deal with during the last years of the Robertson administration. First, there was the question of raising tuition and other fees, always a risky decision. The board voted on February 20, 1945, to increase the tuition from \$500 to \$600 and the maintenance fee from \$525 to \$575. Then, later in the year, the problem of Professor McDougle's radio program arose. Dr. Ivan E. McDougle, professor of economics and sociology, had been broadcasting a Sunday program of commentary on economic matters, and Goucher's name was prominently mentioned both on the air and in advertisements for the broadcasts. The program had aroused adverse criticism, and since it was a commercial venture sponsored by a local chiropractor, the board asked Professor McDougle to stop using the College's name. He complied with the request until, shortly thereafter, the series of broadcasts came to an end.⁵⁹

An important concern—though, happily, not a problem—of the Board of Trustees during the Robertson era involved the College's academic standing. On January 11, 1947, The Middle States Association, the accrediting body for institutions situated in New York State, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, the District of Columbia, and U.S. territories in the Caribbean, set up a program in which all Middle States institutions would be visited within a twelve-year period. This later became a ten-year cycle, and Goucher has so far had three team visits, in 1958, 1967, and 1977, each leading to reaffirmation of accreditation.⁶⁰

Other Trustee Concerns

A question arose in the forties that provided a rare example of an issue of direct concern to all College constituencies: should the College's "fraternities" (as they had always been called at Goucher) continue after the College moved to Towson? In 1944 the pages of *Weekly* contained a series of letters from students favorable or opposed to the "fraternities," and the debate continued sporadically for several years. On October 20, 1947, the Executive Committee received requests from the Baltimore Alumnae Clubs of the Kappa Alpha Theta and Alpha Gamma Delta sororities for information concerning their future status at Goucher. Finally, in a report to the Faculty, a Committee on the Future Status of Sororities concluded, after weighing the evidence, that sororities did not benefit Goucher College and recommended that they terminate when the College officially moved to the county campus. The committee suggested establishing a comprehensive social program to fill the gap left by the abolished sororities.⁶¹ When the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees adopted the Faculty committee's report on May 3, 1948, the Goucher "fraternities" came to an end.⁶²

Student Life

Though the sororities disappeared, the Tone Committee remained a potent force on campus in the forties. Its principal task at that time, to maintain proper standards for student dress on all occasions, put the



Group in the hay, 1950s

committee at pains to clarify the new rules applicable to the Towson site, because students were now living and working simultaneously in two quite different environments. According to a *Weekly* article published on October 20, 1944, "The Students' Organization feels that adherence to these rules is so important that a student who repeatedly violates them may be brought before the Judicial Board." The rules stipulated for the Towson campus were, in summary:

1. No shorts on campus and no slacks off campus except when riding a bicycle
2. No slacks or shorts in the dining room or drawing room at any time
3. No housecoats in the recreation room, main hall, or dining room
4. No riding clothes or bandannas in the dining room for dinner
5. No smoking on the streets of Towson or outside the Towson waiting room
6. No sunbathing anywhere on campus in sight of the buildings
7. Sunbathing allowed at all times on the lawn between East and South Houses
8. No sunbathing on the sun deck after one o'clock on Sunday afternoon; at all other times, shorts and halters, shorts and shirts, or bathing suits may be worn, but men are prohibited from the recreation room during sunbathing hours
9. No bedroom slippers or ski-sock shoes in the dining room or any other "public" place in the dormitory
10. No lumber jackets or shirttails worn outside of skirts at dinner time⁶³

The Tone Committee lasted almost two more decades, disappearing in 1962, when, with changing times, it became outmoded in the eyes of students.⁶⁴

The eighteen years of the Robertson administration were among the most productive in Goucher's history, despite seemingly relentless adversity. Apart from some weakness in the financial area, the magnitude of President Robertson's achievements during his eighteen years in office marks him as one of the best of the College's presidents. Declining enrollments resulting in mounting deficits, obstacles to fund-raising made more formidable by the depression, unavailable labor and building materials during the war years, even natural phenomena like the inclement spring weather that delayed the opening of three buildings or the tornado that threatened to destroy Mary Fisher Hall—all these frustrations together could easily have paralyzed the leaders of any small and insufficiently endowed college. Perhaps partly because he could not foresee all these potential disasters, the new president in 1930 presented a platform involving improvements in governance, a revitalized curriculum, and better control of finances. The outcome was a restructuring of the College and of the curriculum that lasted virtually intact for thirty years, some features of which still survive today—a half-century later.

To be sure, changes in governance and curriculum—relatively inexpensive undertakings—could have been carried through despite severe financial handicaps, but even the idea of a college with minimal endowment beginning construction of an entirely new campus in the midst of the worst economic depression in history and with World War II looming ahead suggests either foolhardiness or heroism on the part of those who accepted the risks. Goucher's move from city to county required a spirit of exceptional forbearance and cooperation on the part of faculty and students and the strong support of alumnae. All these qualities were much in evidence during the transition. Few other institutions have successfully surmounted such obstacles. While it inevitably made mistakes, the Robertson administration was marked by outstanding achievements, and the seemingly indomitable spirit of all members of the community in this difficult period represents a human victory in which the College may take justifiable pride.

Conclusion

P a r t T w o



*T h e K r a u s h a a r
A d m i n i s t r a t i o n
(1 9 4 8 - 1 9 6 7)*



F I V E



Early Perceptions of Goucher by a New President (1948)

During the early months of 1982, 1982, at the suggestion of President Rhoda M. Dorsey, President Emeritus Otto F. Kraushaar recorded 156 pages of personal reminiscences based on his nineteen years as president of the College.¹ The resulting untitled manuscript is intended—as he says in his preface—“chiefly for the eyes of any future historians of Goucher College.” The purpose of the document is manifest: “It is not my aim to write an objective history of all that transpired at Goucher from 1948 to 1967 during the years of my administration, but rather to record my insider’s view of certain selected developments—how they originated, who helped shape and influence them, and my impressions of their outcome.” Readers of the following chapters will readily measure President Kraushaar’s contribution to the understanding of events that took place during his administration: he has placed the College and its current historian greatly in his debt. (All quotations and paraphrases of Dr. Kraushaar in part 2 of this book, unless otherwise noted, are from his unpublished manuscript.)

In the preface to his memoirs, President Kraushaar writes: “My term at Goucher happened to coincide with years of rapid growth in American higher education, except at the very end, when the national student rebellion was emerging. Although years of growth pose many difficult problems, they are easier to cope with than years of recession and increasing limitations.” Indeed, coming as they did between the struggle for survival that characterized the Robertson administration and the crises that have occasionally marked the post-Kraushaar period, these middle years create an effect similar to the quiet episode that serves as a buffer between the more turbulent first and last movements of numerous symphonies. When one considers, however, the monumental tasks and problems facing Dr. Kraushaar as he took over the leadership of

*First Impressions of a
Goucher Presidential
Candidate*

Goucher, one realizes the limits of the analogy: while the volume—measured in terms of adversity—descended to *mezzo forte*, the tempo of events during the nearly two decades from 1948 to 1967 was rarely *adagio*.

When the chairman of Goucher's Board of Trustees first approached Otto F. Kraushaar about the presidency of the College, the candidate, a professor of philosophy at Smith College, had recently returned from three wartime years (1943–46) as an army officer. Dr. Kraushaar had begun his military duties as chief education officer at the Middle East command headquarters in Cairo. In the fall of 1944 he was recalled to the United States to undertake a mission as field representative of the army education branch, "a kind of travelling salesman of Army Education Services," as Dr. Kraushaar puts it. Upon completion of that assignment, he was ordered to report to General MacArthur's command headquarters in the Pacific theatre. "I remained there as chief education officer of the Pacific command through the move of the advanced echelon to Tokyo and provided some assistance to the reconstruction of the Japanese system of education under General MacArthur's stewardship."

"My point about my Army service," Dr. Kraushaar explains, "is that it not only enabled me to learn a great deal about administration on a vast scale, but also showed me that I had some talent in that direction. Indeed, upon my return to the classroom at Smith, from which I had been on leave for three action-packed years, I found teaching relatively more parochial and tepid, less challenging, and far less exciting than the military duties I had left behind. This was the primary reason why I gave some thought to shifting from teaching to college administration."

Though the possibility of a presidency had arisen several times earlier



President Otto F. Kraushaar, 1948–67

and had even appealed to him, this was not something that Dr. Kraushaar “yearned for at that time.” Nonetheless, when Mr. Francis A. Davis, then chairman of the Board of Trustees, first wrote to him in the spring of 1947 about the Goucher presidency, Dr. Kraushaar accepted Mr. Davis’s invitation to visit Baltimore, confer with a trustee committee, and have a look at the College. Beginning with this first visit, Dr. Kraushaar’s own words best express his impressions of Goucher.

“It is difficult to describe my impressions of Baltimore and of Goucher during the day and a half I spent on my first visit. I knew, of course, that I was being scrutinized by everyone I met, so I naturally wondered what kind of an impression I was making; but since I enjoyed the happy state of one not too concerned about moving or changing his vocation, I could afford to be quite myself without the temptation to put on any kind of front. In other words, I was not aching for the job. Moreover, what I saw of Baltimore and Goucher during that first visit, particularly the physical aspects of the College and the city, left me with grave doubts as to whether I wanted to work in such an environment.

“My prior impressions of Baltimore, not a good augury, consisted of several stopovers by rail during my war service, and a motor trip through the city on Route U.S. 40 some years earlier. Of course, my basis of comparison for Goucher was Smith College, at that time in one of the brightest and best periods of its long and distinguished history. Though I was plainly depressed with much of what I saw, I also felt that Goucher had all kinds of potential, as yet only partially realized. So, on the rail trip home, as I reviewed my day and a half in Baltimore, I came up with a very mixed assessment. I felt fortunate that I was neither seeking the job nor truly in need of it; at the same time, I felt that I saw enough room for growth to warrant my continued interest. Still, if the negotiations ended right then and there, I thought this would be no personal loss whatever.

“Then came the next visit, sometime in early summer; this time I met members of the Faculty Selection Committee. The members of this committee quizzed me closely, in a friendly way, about my philosophy of education and my views on faculty participation in matters of college governance. I remember being particularly impressed by Eleanor Spencer, professor of fine arts, and Clinton Winslow, professor of political science and Dr. Robertson’s administrative assistant. I was taken on a full and extensive tour of the physical facilities of the College, and again I had considerable pause for thought about the prospect of moving to Goucher should I be selected. The old campus looked shabby and worn by comparison with college campuses I knew. I did, however, admire the architecture of old Goucher Hall and some of the other downtown buildings, grimy as they were. As for the new campus, though it seemed somewhat unreal in its undeveloped form, it suggested almost limitless possibilities.

“The approach to the ‘new campus’ at the time was depressing. At the corner of Dulaney Valley and Joppa Roads, where Hutzler’s store now stands, huddled a decrepit inn with a rutted, unpaved parking lot; on the opposite corner squatted an old grocery store with heaped-over trash cans directly by the intersection of Joppa and Dulaney. Dulaney Valley Road was nothing but a narrow little way closely flanked on both sides by locust trees festooned with honeysuckle vines. Then, abruptly, one came to an opening on the right—the original gateway, located about

three hundred yards above the present entrance. Pleasantly landscaped, that old entry offered a strong contrast to the unkempt condition of the woods and roadway leading to it. A turn in the straight campus drive led past the rump of a building destined to become the science building; around a curve the butt of another building appeared, the first stub of Van Meter Hall; and then, suddenly, Mary Fisher Hall, the only completed edifice on the campus at the time, loomed starkly out of the landscape. Beyond Mary Fisher Hall, construction work progressed slowly on what were later to become the first two houses of Anna Heubeck Hall. That was all. The 'new campus,' as it was then always referred to, consisted of just this cluster set in the midst of an island of grass surrounded by an almost impenetrable tangle of shrubs, vines, and trees. Fortunately, many summers of my adolescence and college years spent working at construction jobs of various kinds had awakened in me an interest in architecture. So the ordeal of building a new campus and moving a college was not quite as overwhelming to me as it might have been.

"After that second visit, a letter offering me the presidency arrived. The offer itself is rather interesting in retrospect because of the change in salary scale brought about by post-war inflation. I was offered an initial salary of \$12,000 per year, an entertainment fund of \$1,000, an additional allowance for travel and entertainment for the benefit of the College, the 'services of a Negro houseman,' and a residence complete with heat, light, water, and telephone. As I read this letter, I began to appreciate that the financial advantages of moving would be substantial. The proposed salary and perquisites amounted to about triple my salary at Smith College, then \$6,500. I faced an inducement which I could not easily reject.

"After conferring once more with Marjorie Nicholson [then dean of Smith College], I finally accepted the offer, but not without some misgivings. My appointment, confirmed and settled in early July 1947, would take effect on July 1, 1948."

*President Kraushaar
Assumes His New
Duties*

Here again, Dr. Kraushaar's words describing the situation he encountered when he arrived in Baltimore are more eloquent than any paraphrase:

"Though my new duties at Goucher were slated to begin July 1, 1948, by prearrangement with Vice President Clark Hobbs, who assured me that nothing much needed to be done until after the Fourth of July, we planned to arrive the evening of July 3. Clark had reserved a room for us at the Belvedere Hotel; we had asked that there be no fuss or special reception to start with. As we approached Baltimore, we found ourselves quite by chance on Joppa Road, the location of the house which the College had acquired for our residence. Naturally curious about our new home, we continued on Joppa Road until we arrived at number 206. To our delight, the front door was open. We discovered the sole occupant, a College workman, Joshua Skipper, known simply as Skip—a short, rather stocky, very inarticulate person with a somewhat tortured and twisted face and one bad eye.² He, of course, did not know us from Adam, though after we identified ourselves, he urged us to have a good look around. It was plain that the house was some days away

from being ready for occupancy. We liked what we saw of the premises, particularly the yard sloping down from Joppa Road to the boundary of the campus (there was no Goucher Boulevard at the time) and handsomely landscaped with many English boxwoods. So, we continued to the Belvedere, where we spent our first days in a hotel room with a very noisy, erratic air conditioner trying its ancient best to cope with a typically hot and humid Baltimore weekend in July.

"By the time the Fourth dawned, eager to start work, I walked the short distance from the Belvedere to old Goucher Hall, empty because of the holiday. I found my office readily enough and, on the presidential desk, a pile of notes and documents that Dr. Robertson had very thoughtfully left for me pertaining to matters with which I had to come to grips quickly. They included such items as staff positions that remained to be filled.

"So I spent the better part of a warm Fourth of July in empty Goucher Hall poring over the College's records. The initial experience of coming to grips with Goucher's problems was very disquieting. It became apparent at once that the College was in dire financial straits; that it was, in fact, skating on very thin ice. Somehow, Dr. Robertson had managed to close the budget year 1947-48 with a surplus, but only by paying atrociously and unbelievably low salaries. Faculty salaries at Goucher were approximately half those at Smith for comparable rank and length of service. After giving a lifetime of teaching to Goucher, many professors were now approaching retirement with salaries in the range of \$3,000 to \$4,000. By comparison, I had departed from Smith as a recently promoted full professor at a salary of \$6,500. Not a single member of the Goucher College faculty was receiving anything like that amount, even though in many cases their years of service to the College greatly exceeded mine. Then and there, I made up my mind that one of my first priorities had to be raising faculty salaries to decent levels as quickly as possible.

"I also had to grapple with the matter of the tiny, insignificant endowment of the College, which added up to less than a million dollars. In spite of much talk of the Julia Rogers bequest of just under \$1 million which was temporarily listed among endowment assets, this gift would soon be liquidated to realize funds to pay for the construction of the future Julia Rogers Library. It was apparent, moreover, that the trustees and administration of the College had been thinking quite unrealistically about building progress on the new campus. Judge Emory Niles, chairman of the Board of Trustees prior to Francis Davis' assumption of that office, worked closely with the firm of Moore and Hutchins, the architects of the College, who had won the national architectural competition sponsored by Goucher in 1938. Judge Niles was fast friends with Messrs. Moore and Hutchins, the two principals of the firm, and though he did his utmost to speed the rebuilding of the College on the planning and architectural side, as a judge, he felt he could do little about the missing ingredient—money. Obviously, the efforts to get construction on the new campus going again after World War II had resulted in a record of deep frustration, made so by the lack of money and by the lack of any kind of realistic plan and campaign to raise the substantial funds required for that purpose.

"The only financial campaign in progress at the time was the Alum-

nae Gift Building Fund to raise \$500,000 for the completion of Van Meter Hall. The campaign was managed by a doughty group of Baltimore alumnae without the benefit of professional fund-raising counsel. It soon became apparent to me that their effort, however laudatory it seemed, was penny-wise and pound-foolish; the objective was too small and pursued without the benefit of real organization or professional know-how. That such a project had been conceived and launched at all proved that the administration of the College and the trustees had not begun to come to grips with the magnitude of the problem they faced.

"I had some inkling of this rather dismal state of affairs before taking over my duties at Goucher. Though the perquisites of office included a residence for the president's family, at the time of the negotiations no such residence was available. There were two prior presidents' houses in Goucher history, both still in the possession of the College in 1948, but my wife and I rejected both for various reasons. The first was the elegant Goucher House, Dr. John Franklin Goucher's townhouse designed by Stanford White, on St. Paul between 23rd and 24th Streets. In 1948 it was serving as a dormitory. The other president's house, situated at the corner of Charles and 23rd Street, was often referred to as "The President's House," although by 1948 it too had been pressed into service as a dormitory for students. That house had been the dwelling of Dr. Guth and his family during the 1910s and 20s. It was offered to us as a possible place to live, but after some reflection, my wife and I decided against it for several reasons. For one thing, the house was producing some income for the College as a downtown dormitory; moreover, we had fairly strong personal reasons for not wanting to begin our tour of duty at Goucher as city-dwellers.

"Judge Emory Niles, ever eager to begin some new construction on the Towson campus, conceived the idea of asking Moore and Hutchins to design a new residence that could be temporarily occupied by the president and then converted into the original unit of a faculty housing project on the campus. Moore and Hutchins were authorized by the trustees to draw up a plan for such a house, but no one liked or approved the result. The College's architectural Advisory Board vetoed the plan, and both my wife and I felt that living in a house isolated at some distance from the major college buildings on the new campus was scarcely an inviting prospect. Moreover, I thought that with all the College's urgent institutional needs to construct essential college buildings—laboratories, dormitories, a new library, and numerous other facilities absolutely crucial to the College's work and existence—committing the new campus plan to a faculty housing project was unwise.³

"The trustees finally solved the housing dilemma in a very sensible way by authorizing Vice President Hobbs to search in the area of the new college campus for a suitable residential property that could be acquired by the College as a President's House. In a few weeks, he recommended to the trustees the Williamson property at 206 East Joppa Road; the transaction was settled and the house vacated just in time for our arrival in Baltimore in July 1948.

"The point of this long digression about the house is to illustrate the Board's lack of direction and resolve in facing up to the numerous problems that it had to confront, especially with reference to the lack of

a firm plan for prosecuting the rebuilding of the College and raising the money essential for that staggering enterprise. On that lonely Fourth of July in hot, empty Goucher Hall, I realized the enormity of the task before me. The critical need was to step up the fund-raising activities of the College as speedily as possible, to begin the preparation of a step-by-step move that would complete the transfer to the new campus. At the same time, I was committed to lifting faculty salaries substantially. The College's needs in terms of funding extended to practically every aspect of its activity."

With the end of the summer vacation, President Kraushaar discovered new challenges:

"Once the College had opened and the students had returned, the division of the College between two campuses separated by eight miles posed a very serious handicap in a number of respects: student recruitment, scheduling of classes, access of students to the College's central library, faculty time and wear and tear in being transported by bus to classes at some distance, added expense for bus transportation. Moreover, the lack of adequate funding for the prosecution of the plan to rebuild the campus, for faculty salaries, for scholarships, for maintenance purposes—all these combined to place Goucher in a difficult competitive position with other institutions that were enjoying a more normal existence. Back of it all, I sensed one step that would have to be taken in due course—rebuilding the Board of Trustees by recruiting new and younger people who could help brighten Goucher's image and heighten the confidence and pride of the community of Baltimore in the College. During those first weeks I asked myself many times: How did I ever get myself into this predicament?

"But the situation was not without its positive factors. For one thing, a very good spirit persisted among the faculty of the College, a rather old faculty overwhelmingly made up of women, among them some truly excellent teachers and scholars. The more I read of the record of the College in the past, the more I could see that there was a good solid academic foundation to build on. Moreover, another factor remained in our favor, at least temporarily: in 1948, the glut of returning war veterans seeking a college education had not yet fully subsided, so one could look forward to a year or two of adequate student applications and enrollment.⁴ But the demographic prognostications made it clear that this would be a short-lived advantage; I knew that by the early 1950s, once the returning veterans had completed their education, student enrollment would drop.

"With the opening of College and the return of the students, the tempo of events picked up rapidly. I had prepared carefully for the opening Convocation, the occasion of my first introduction to the entire College community. I well understood the importance of getting off to a good start as I faced this new community of students, faculty, and members of my administrative staff. I knew that among them was a coterie of persons who felt close to and admired Dr. Robertson—a typical situation whenever there is a transition from one presidency to another. In their eyes I was on trial. I understood all this, so I was determined to be patient and to win them over gradually to my way of thinking and doing.

*New Perspectives
as the College
Opened in 1948*

"It is not for me, as Dr. David Allan Robertson's successor, to evaluate or comment on his administration of the College. Let me say only that I had an opportunity to know him well enough to become aware of the differences between us and the different ways in which we approached our duties at Goucher College. He was inclined to shyness and to seek protection in a certain formality in his relations with others, including members of the College staff and faculty. My style was by nature different; I was inclined to conduct business affairs in an informal way, to try to build up congenial relationships with the people I worked with, and to repose the maximum of trust in each member of the faculty and each College staff officer with whom I dealt repeatedly. In other words, my life style and administrative style differed markedly from Dr. Robertson's, and many in the Convocation appeared to sense and welcome the change.

"When Dr. Robertson came to Goucher in the fall of 1930, he inherited a somewhat confused situation as a result of the prolonged illness and eventual death of Dr. Guth in the late 1920's. Dr. Robertson appeared to everyone to be exceptionally well qualified for the Goucher presidency. His inauguration in April, 1931, was a brilliant affair with a large attendance of visiting scholars and dignitaries, all accompanied by much fanfare and publicity. At the time he took office, he had a fresh vision of what a college curriculum for women could and should be. At his first faculty meeting he described his ambitions for Goucher in the following words: 'Let us work out an educational program in this institution that will capture the imagination of businessmen in Baltimore, New York, and elsewhere; we should then have little difficulty in realizing our dream of the future. . . . Our educational program is more important than our architectural future.'⁵ In other words, it was Dr. Robertson's hope that he could, by the introduction of a sparkling new curriculum, develop the financial support needed to solve the many problems he had inherited. But the situation was even more complicated than that. He took office at a time when the depression threatened the solvency not only of private colleges, but of all other institutions as well. So, instead of undertaking to raise money to move the College to the new campus, he chose to concentrate for the first four or five years on working closely with the faculty in reforming the curriculum.

"That curriculum was still solidly in place when I arrived at Goucher. It had its strong adherents and defenders among the faculty and recent alumnae. It had certain distinct merits. When I arrived in 1948, the college curricular reform that was in the air nationally involved the introduction of newly designed, integrated, general education courses; there was a determined effort to overcome the departmentalization and fragmentation of the students' course of study. The Goucher Curriculum, on the other hand, undertook to integrate the students' program by means of sophomore general examinations based on eight defined objectives of general education. The slogan governing the students' selection from the list of largely departmental courses during the first two years was 'freedom under guidance.'

"During the period of my return from Army service and my leave-taking from Northampton, I had been active on the Smith College Curriculum Committee, which was engaged in a curricular reform of another kind. Taking a leaf out of Harvard's experience, described in a

book, *General Education in a Free Society*, published by the Harvard University Press in 1945, we actively redesigned the Smith curriculum by the introduction of a number of basic general education courses. I had long ago reached the conclusion that one of the serious weaknesses of undergraduate education in America was the fragmentation of the students' course of study into numerous departmental courses, each of which had its departmental rationale but was often discontinuous with the courses of other related departments.

"Some of the Goucher faculty had gotten wind of my interest in general education through redesigned interdepartmental courses and were somewhat apprehensive that I might try to precipitate another full battle over curricular reform. As I became acquainted with my Goucher duties and the personnel and curriculum of the College in the fall of 1948, I soon decided that the burning question at the time was not more curricular reform, but moving the College. I was sufficiently persuaded of the merits of Dr. Robertson's curriculum to be willing to forego any revisionary attention to it at the outset. Furthermore, the attrition suffered by the College because of the divided campus was real, immediate, and constant; so, instead of choosing a course which I would have found much more congenial to my own interests—that of enlisting the faculty in reconsidering the curriculum—I chose the (to me) far less interesting and more difficult course of pushing the planning and the money-raising for the completion of the new campus. In other words, I chose a strategy quite different from the one Dr. Robertson had followed in 1930, and for very good reasons.

"To return to my first Convocation talk, the response of my audience made me feel that I had taken an important first step in earning recognition and confidence. Students came to wish me well, and several college officers and members of the faculty also came forward to extend their good wishes. I think we all realized that we had to work together, that we could work together, to increase Goucher's stature.

"It was apparent to me that, to be ready for the years of fund-raising on a scale much larger than anything ever before undertaken by Goucher, the entire college community—faculty, staff, governing board, alumnae, as well as our home city of Baltimore—had first to prepare psychologically for this difficult ordeal. It was up to me to inspire fresh hope and confidence that the long-delayed move to the new campus could and would be accomplished expeditiously, and that, in the meantime, faculty salaries would be raised and the morale of the College community would be lifted. Not a few skeptics, both within and outside the College community, were resigned to accepting a second-class status for Goucher. After all, they argued, the College was a quiet Methodist institution with a good but narrow academic reputation, a college that most people in Baltimore knew little about and took no particular pride in. A major goal of the 'psychological preparation' I had in mind was to interpret the College, its past accomplishments and its current problems and needs, nationally to the community of Goucher alumnae and locally to the business and corporate community of Baltimore.

"I was not clear at first how to do this, except by losing no opportunity to present the case for the College to various audiences. I was confident that I could get along with the Goucher students, for I always enjoyed excellent rapport with young people wherever I had taught—at

Iowa, Harvard, Radcliffe, Smith, Mount Holyoke, and Amherst. Repeated invitations to speak to Smith alumnae clubs had taught me about alumnae attitudes toward their Alma Mater, both pro and con. I had talked to enough non-academic groups to know something about what outsiders most admire and fear in a college. And, since I had spent practically all my life in an academic environment,⁶ I felt reasonably confident that I could establish good rapport with the Goucher faculty and staff and with academic colleagues in neighboring institutions. Though I approached the task at Goucher with some trepidation, I felt by no means devoid of hope and spirit.”



*Completion of the
“ Minimal Campus ”
(1948 – 1954)*

Having decided by the beginning of the 1948–49 academic year that his first priority must be the consolidation of all Goucher activities on the new campus since “further delays could entail the bankruptcy and possible demise of the College,” President Kraushaar asked Vice President Hobbs to make “a survey of the financial condition of the College in relation to building needs, faculty salaries, and maintenance requirements, in a long-range program to be submitted for discussion to the Executive Committee and to the full Board of Trustees.” Dr. Kraushaar hoped for a realistic ten-year development plan with clear goals and firm timing for each step along the way. He announced this initiative to the Executive Committee on September 20, 1948, and at his first meeting with the full board he urged “a rapid completion of the transfer of the College to the County campus,” reported on Mr. Hobbs’s study (then in progress), and suggested “the organization of a campaign for funds.” Judge Morris Soper then moved that “the Executive Committee be requested to re-study existing plans for the development of a campus building program and report back to the Board.”¹

*President Kraushaar’s
First Year*

When he took office, Dr. Kraushaar found the *modus operandi* of the existing planning process so well established and workable that he made few changes in it. The clearly defined roles of the president, trustees, Faculty Planning Committee, Architectural Advisory Board, and architects had produced good results. Up to this point Messrs. Moore and Hutchins had been the sole architects of the campus. They met with President Kraushaar’s general approval, with a few reservations: “On the whole, that firm served us well indeed, although I became concerned, by the mid-1950s, over the repetition and uniformity in design of both the exteriors and interiors of our buildings. Once they had settled on the design of Mary Fisher Hall, the first building erected on

the campus, there was a strong tendency to replicate certain elements of that plan, including the fieldstone walls, the heavy red-tiled roofs which required a heavy and costly roof structure, and the particular fenestration employed in Mary Fisher Hall. Reasonable, accommodating, and unwilling to compromise with quality, Messrs. Moore and Hutchins were good to work with. They rendered the design for Mary Fisher Hall, Anna Heubeck Hall (built in several stages),² Froelicher Hall, the original section of Lilian Welsh Hall, the three major buildings in the academic unit other than the College Center, the Chapel, the Alumnae House, the Plant Laboratory (which later became the Psychology Annex), and several temporary service buildings, one of which was later consumed by fire.³ Moreover, the disposition of the buildings according to the original master plan, which underwent considerable modifications over the years, is basically theirs.

"Looking over this process, I wish I could have foreseen from the plans that the placement and disposition of the various units of the campus—student residence halls, the student recreational and sports complex, and the academic complex, including the College Center—would prove somewhat too dispersed for a small college population. The architects and campus planners of the late 1930s were tempted into this rather extravagant use of space because the College had acquired 421 acres, a truly enormous tract of land for a college the size of Goucher."⁴

By January 1949 Mr. Hobbs had completed his assigned task, and a special meeting of the full board convened "to consider the ten-year development program for Goucher College."⁵ At that meeting Dr. Kraushaar emphasized the urgency of maintaining the best faculty possible and raising sufficient funds to move the entire College without delay. These remarks led to a protracted discussion about organizing a campaign under professional guidance to raise enough money to meet the immediate building needs and to protect the endowment capital invested in the residence halls. After this discussion the board authorized the Executive Committee and the president to consult with a professional fund-raising agency.⁶

While official minutes are essential sources of information for any college historian, they do not always tell the whole story, as the following observations by President Kraushaar demonstrate: "There was one issue that does not appear directly in the minutes of either the Executive Committee or the full Board but which proved to be a controlling factor in the discussion of the building program at our meetings. It concerned the architectural plans and the timing of the construction of the Julia Rogers Library. This was a favorite project with Dr. Robertson and, consequently, with the architects also.⁷ Judge Emory Niles shared their enthusiasm. Unfortunately, the architects were ready with a library plan so elaborate and costly that there was no point in putting it out for bids. As I gradually became acquainted with the personalities on the Board and the different concepts about the timing and order of the various building projects, I reached the conclusion that the library plan was being pushed prematurely. To build a library on the new campus while half the students were still living in downtown dormitories was logistically a mistake. Furthermore, the architects had not, up to that point,

developed a realistic plan in terms of the Julia Rogers legacy of about one million dollars which had been earmarked for that project. So, one of the goals I had in mind was to gain acceptance for a new and changed priority among the building projects on the new campus."⁸

Earlier, President Kraushaar had tried to persuade the Board that Goucher's fund-raising efforts were seriously inadequate, and he had prepared the ground for obtaining professional help to organize a major campaign. On November 15, 1948, he had already presented to the Executive Committee Mr. John Price Jones, the head of a professional fund-raising firm based in New York. "This was a first step in encouraging the trustees to consider professional fund-raising assistance. My limited experience in campaigns at Smith convinced me that no large amount of money was likely to be raised by home-spun efforts such as the Alumnae Gift Building Campaign. Mr. Jones did not make a good impression at our Executive Committee, but his presence and comments bore some good fruit. The question of engaging professional fund-raising counsel occupied much of our discussion in both the Executive Committee and full Board meetings during the winter of 1948-49. These discussions led rather more quickly than I had expected to the authorization to employ the local firm of Donald Hammond Associates."⁹

"The next step was to reach some kind of satisfactory understanding with the Alumnae Gift Building Fund organization which had been working quietly for several years, accumulating about \$300,000. I greatly admired the alumnae for their initiative of proposing and organizing a fund-raising campaign largely on their own, but it was conceived on too small a scale and would tend to muddy the waters for a badly needed, much larger campaign. At the same time, we did not wish to hurt the feelings of alumnae leaders who had been so helpful to the College. Eventually, the Alumnae Gift Building Campaign became part of a new two million dollar national campaign, the first phase of which would concentrate on the Baltimore corporate public and on Goucher's alumnae and friends in the area."¹⁰

Meanwhile, architectural planning for the new campus was advancing rapidly. The enlarged and extended Van Meter Hall opened in the fall of 1949,¹¹ after which the question became what to build next. While a small group on the Executive Committee still favored immediate construction of the library, President Kraushaar persuaded the committee as a whole that the next objective should be to house the entire residential student population on the new campus. This required authorizing the plans for Residence Hall No. 3, later known as Froelicher Hall.¹²

The design Moore and Hutchins submitted for the future Froelicher Hall won the approval of the Architectural Advisory Board, but not that of the Faculty Planning Committee chaired by Professor Winslow. The minutes of the Executive Committee meeting on April 4, 1949, record the latter group's objections to "certain undesirable features":

1. 100 percent double rooms instead of a predominance of singles
2. Houses with populations from 58 to 68 rather than from 40 to 50
3. Absence of common meeting rooms in each house

4. *Minimum* quarters for residential faculty, reducing the possibility of group meetings in the apartments
5. Absence of "date parlors"
6. Complete uniformity of rooms, with long corridors, contributing to "institutional" appearance of houses¹³

The Executive Committee asked Dr. Winslow to seek cost estimates for rectifying the third and fourth objections; ultimately many of the "undesirable features" were eliminated or improved, but financial stringency was the ultimate determinant, and the completed building aroused little enthusiasm.

Construction of Froelicher Hall began in the summer of 1949, and the building opened in the fall of 1950, a happy event because it enabled the College to close all downtown residence halls and consolidate all resident students on the new campus.¹⁴ The trustees then asked Moore and Hutchins to draft plans for a more affordable library.

The Executive Committee had voted, on February 27, 1950, to reconstitute the Julia Rogers Fund (whose resources the College had used to build Van Meter and Froelicher Halls) by returning to it the first available monies from the 1950 campaign. The reconstituted fund, equal to the original bequest of \$950,000, would then be devoted to building the Julia Rogers Library. On March 13 the president reported to the Executive Committee that Messrs. Moore and Hutchins had submitted "a highly satisfactory" preliminary sketch of the library with an overall estimated cost of approximately \$750,000.

Revised plans for the library were submitted in the first week of November, and a request for bids followed shortly thereafter.¹⁵ Excavation began on December 21, and on September 8, 1952, President Kraushaar announced that the book collection had been moved, and the Julia Rogers Library was ready to operate. The net cost of the building amounted to \$606,707. A very successful Open House to celebrate completion of the library took place on December 7;¹⁶ the formal dedication highlighted a library conference held on April 10 and 11, 1953, that drew over three hundred guests.

The immediate success of the new library is demonstrated by statistics concerning its use. According to the minutes of the Board of Trustees' meeting on June 13, 1953, library readers downtown in 1951-52 numbered 4,185; the following year readers numbered 16,922, a 400 percent increase.¹⁷

"We conceived our new Julia Rogers Library," comments Dr. Kraushaar, "as much more than a place in which to store and dispense books; we equipped it with the slides, photographs, and picture collections of the Fine Arts Department, the record collections of the Music Department, a language laboratory (in due course), and, as they became available, microfiche, microcard, and electronic library aids.

"Because of a string of lean financial years, the library's book collection suffered from substantial gaps.¹⁸ Once we could glimpse the end of the rebuilding and moving process, and once funds for faculty salaries and scholarships began to approach decent levels, we began to increase the library's budget for the purchase of books and periodicals with a view not only to keeping up with new and current publications and the

inflation, but to filling in some of these gaps. This was slow work, and the progress made is not easy to assess: a merely quantitative determination of the size of the collection is not an adequate measure. We were assisted in this by the founding (in 1949) and active membership of the Friends of the Library, made up primarily of Goucher alumnae and friends of the College who contributed funds and book collections and furnished a nucleus of dedicated workers for the repair of books."

Meanwhile, Donald Hammond and his associates were at work planning the financial campaign. Mr. Hammond concluded early in his projections that the College needed to improve its image in the Baltimore corporate community if it hoped to raise substantial sums from that source. This idea inspired him to make a novel proposal: create, parallel to the Board of Trustees, a new board without trustee powers or responsibilities, which he suggested calling the Board of Overseers. The overseers' primary function would be "to assist the College in its financial policy"—a euphemistic phrase meaning "contribute generously to the College"—and "to examine the plans of the College for its physical growth and development." The overseers would also "cooperate with the President of the College and the Trustees in formulating, implementing, and supervising plans whereby a better understanding may be created in the minds of the public with respect to the College's functions, its contributions to education and the community, and its needs." Naturally, the first members of the "public" the College would educate in these matters were the overseers themselves. In short, the idea behind Mr. Hammond's ingenious proposal was to recruit as many as possible of the corporate heads of the Baltimore business community to this new board so that they could help solve the College's physical and financial problems. The next question was *how* to recruit them—assuming, of course, that the Board of Trustees accepted Mr. Hammond's idea.

Somewhat to Dr. Kraushaar's surprise, the trustees thought well of the notion of a Board of Overseers almost from the beginning,¹⁹ and Mr. Hammond suggested that the best way to attract the corporate leaders would be to persuade Mr. Roy White, president of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, to host a luncheon in a downtown hotel at which President Kraushaar could speak about Goucher, its problems, and prospects. Mr. Hammond felt that Mr. White had such prestige in the economic community of Baltimore that very few corporate executives would refuse his invitation. Happily, this proved correct. Mr. White agreed to host the luncheon, and Dr. Kraushaar spoke so persuasively that twenty-eight of the thirty-five invited guests became the charter members of Goucher's new Board of Overseers. Dr. Kraushaar notes in his reminiscences that "this step was eminently successful over the next ten or twelve years in bringing gifts and grants to Goucher."

President Kraushaar's summary of his first year at Goucher fore-shadows subsequent events: "As that utterly welcome summer lull began in July, 1949, we could look back on our first Goucher year as one of severe testing. As we were driving north to our rented cottage in South Ashfield, Massachusetts, I reviewed the events of that first year and had reason to be grateful. It had been for me by far the most difficult and trying year of my professional life. My wife and I had come to Goucher and Baltimore as relatively young strangers who now had reason to believe that we had won a promising measure of initial acceptance and

confidence from trustees, students, faculty, alumnae, and the Baltimore community. We had initiated in that first year a \$2 million campaign for funds, up to that time by far the largest ever in Goucher's history. The newly created Board of Overseers promised to gain for the College a wider recognition by the corporate and institutional leaders of Baltimore. The alumnae, some of them alienated by the long-delayed move to the new campus and the resulting frustrations, were showing signs of renewed enthusiasm for, and confidence in, the College. Student morale seemed on the rise, and the long-suffering faculty appeared inordinately grateful for the small, token increases in salary—the best we could do to begin with—that were in their contracts for the next year.²⁰

*Completing the
"Minimal Campus":
The Science Building
and the Gymnasium*

Once Froelicher Hall had opened,²¹ two buildings remained whose completion was essential to achieving what President Kraushaar sometimes referred to as the "minimal campus," that is, one capable of housing approximately 700 residential students and the classrooms, laboratories, and basic recreational facilities required for them. These two structures, the science building and the gymnasium, particularly the former, raised thorny problems whose story, as Dr. Kraushaar says, "is told in cryptic style in the minutes of the Executive Committee meetings during the summer and fall of 1951 and the early months of 1952." Dr. Kraushaar's account, by contrast, is quite clear: "Briefly, the problem was this. I had gained access to Mr. Samuel Hoffberger, at that time the patriarch of that large and philanthropic family. Our discussions led eventually to an agreement by Samuel Hoffberger that he would try to interest his family in contributing \$250,000 toward the \$400,000 to \$500,000 we needed to complete and extend the science building; in return for this substantial assistance Goucher would name the science building after the Hoffberger family. Mr. Hoffberger was as good as his word. After an exchange of long letters the family agreed to underwrite the cost of the science building to the extent of \$250,000; however, there was a problem. The family had already contributed \$40,000 or \$50,000 and wished to extend the time period of the rest of the contribution over eight or nine years. At the same time, they expected Goucher to be responsible for raising the balance of the amount needed to complete the building.

"At first this seemed a fair proposition, even though somewhat restrictive, but then real trouble developed. I had been cultivating the Kresge Foundation of Detroit, which at one point sent a representative to scout the new campus and prepare a report and recommendation regarding Goucher for the directors of the Foundation.²² Originally I had planned to secure the balance of approximately \$250,000 needed to complete the science building from the Kresge Foundation. Their representative sent in a good report on Goucher, and after further discussion and several visits to Detroit, just as the grant was about to be signed, Mr. Sebastian Kresge, the patriarch of *that* family, began to demur on the Hoffbergers' time frame for the payment of their family grant. On my way home by air from Detroit one evening, after a meeting with Mr. Kresge, I had visions of both grants going down the drain, and I started planning at once to see what could be salvaged. There was the (as yet

unnamed) Lilian Welsh gymnasium, to cost approximately \$500,000, which was still unfunded. The best tactic seemed to be to propose to our trustees that we accept the Hoffberger grant along with its restricted time frame and apply it to the science building; that would then necessitate raising the balance of approximately \$250,000 for that structure as a special venture. The Kresge grant, if it could be salvaged, could be applied to the cost of the Lilian Welsh gymnasium, although that would also require raising a matching fund of \$250,000.

"When I gave my report on the fateful Detroit visit to our Executive Committee, they were at first crestfallen, but then a fighting spirit took over and the trustees vowed to raise both matching sums within the allotted time limits.²³ The first priority—to keep the Hoffberger grant in line—proved not an easy task, but eventually both parties were mollified to the point of going along with our plan, and the trustees showed unprecedented initiative in raising the two matching funds on time.²⁴ The dreary prospect of losing two grants worth \$500,000 was suddenly transmuted into a realized fund of \$1 million, enough to pay for almost all of the construction costs of both the science building and the gymnasium."

The Executive Committee had authorized the president, on February 27, 1950, to complete plans for the construction of the science building (at an estimated cost of \$400,000) and a physical education building (at an estimated cost of \$650,000).

On April 10 President Kraushaar informed the Executive Committee that Moore and Hutchins had revised earlier drawings for a snack bar and bookstore to be located in the former air raid shelter in Mary Fisher Hall; the committee, in turn, authorized the president to proceed with alterations to accommodate, in the basement of Robinson House, a central post office and a business office,²⁵ and to enlarge quarters for the infirmary in Mary Fisher Hall.

On June 19 the Executive Committee requested the president to proceed as rapidly as possible with plans for a gymnasium-auditorium.

"The Hoffberger Science Building," writes Dr. Kraushaar, "was opened in the fall of 1953²⁶ and dedicated the following April in an impressive ceremony that pleased the Hoffberger family greatly.²⁷ The Lilian Welsh gymnasium was opened in the fall of 1954 and dedicated on November 6. Now at last we had the minimal campus at our disposal—classrooms, laboratories, studios, the Library, student residences, and physical education and sports facilities. We had closed all of our student residences and academic facilities on the downtown campus, and most of them had been sold for sums that helped swell the funds that had to be raised for the construction of buildings on the new campus.

"But it was indeed a 'minimal campus.' The administration offices were still crammed into the wing of Van Meter Hall nearest Mary Fisher; the limited number of faculty offices required sharing by two, three, and even four colleagues; the music and drama departments were without any facilities suitable for teaching, rehearsal or performance; the science faculty had only meager facilities for research; we had in our new gymnasium an auditorium of sorts, but one that was acoustically poor and graceless for such use; there were as yet no studio for the

teaching of dance and no swimming pool; student activities were jammed into odd places in existing buildings that had not been designed for them.

“All the same, once the College had moved wholly to the new campus, it began to have a new image in the minds of Baltimoreans and in the eyes of visitors to the campus. The earlier image of a small, Methodist institution struggling to maintain itself in a then deteriorating section of Baltimore City gave way rapidly to that of a college that was undergoing a renaissance, showing signs of renewed vitality and growing appeal. The fact that we had come this far inspired a new confidence and a feeling that ‘we can do it.’ As this happened, and as alumnae returned to their campus and left it with a renewed pride, and school visitors came to the campus to catch up on developments at Goucher, it became plain that we had gathered momentum and many allies, and that the total completion of the campus and the immediate future of the College was assured.

“Moreover, we were happy to have come as far as we had without incurring any large or permanent debt for our rebuilding. The response of the students was particularly heartwarming. They had seen the College move, rebuild, and regroup itself under their very eyes, and it was for them an exciting and inspiring period of the College’s history. Although we all realized that, in comparison with other fully-built and well-established colleges, we still lacked much by way of facilities, the morale at Goucher was probably never higher than through those years of the middle and later fifties with a population of students who had the unusual experience of watching their college grow and prosper under the special exertions of that time.”



*Completing
the Campus:
The Final Stage*

As President Kraushaar contemplated his administration's activities during his first four years in office, he could take pride in having completed the "minimal campus," but he was also aware of how much remained to be done; the days ahead were not to be in any sense noticeably easier than those that had gone before. Continuing inflation and the cost of building construction made funding of each new large structure a difficult task.

On December 21, 1953, Dr. Kraushaar outlined to the trustee Executive Committee four "urgent building needs":

1. Completion of Robinson-Bennett Dormitory (the future Heubeck Hall)
2. Construction of an administrative building (the future College Center), to contain the administrative offices, a large auditorium and stage, and perhaps the Music Department
3. A small chapel
4. An alumnae house¹

Although the completion of Robinson and Bennett Houses was first on the presidential agenda, the trustees delayed further work on the rest of Anna Heubeck Hall until 1956 because of the great expense involved. They first addressed the fourth item on President Kraushaar's list, an alumnae house.²

The alumnae established an Alumnae House Building Committee in 1953 to make plans for their new headquarters,³ and in 1954 the trustee Executive Committee approved construction of a separate building to serve as the alumnae center and engaged Moore and Hutchins to select a

The Alumnae House



Party at Alumnae House terrace, 1950s

site and make preliminary sketches. Though the architects' plans met only minimum specifications, the cost estimate exceeded the allotted amount by \$31,000; accordingly, the Executive Committee asked Mr. Hutchins to prepare new plans.⁴ The Alumnae House was finally completed in June 1956,⁵ and on August 20 the Executive Committee received word that the Board of Directors of the Alumnae Association had expressed its appreciation of the "thoughtful and wise counsel" of the Trustees in "making possible the pleasant and convenient quarters for the Alumnae," and pledged "the continual support of the Association to the College."⁶ With that, one could reasonably assume that any disaffection on the part of the Alumnae Association remaining from the Guth era had finally disappeared.

*The Stable,
the Entrance Road,
and the Gateway*

Several other projects were initiated ahead of the first three items on President Kraushaar's list of urgent needs. For example, when the stable from which the College had been renting horses went out of business in 1953, the Executive Committee voted to build a new stable and an indoor riding ring on the campus.⁷ The stable, a gift from Mrs. William T. Haebler (who later gave the College the president's house and whose daughters built the chapel), was offered for bids in 1956,⁸ but the plan for the indoor riding ring was abandoned. On October 29, 1962, however, the Executive Committee authorized the construction of a groom's house next to the stable at a cost of \$8,300, the expense to be paid from income derived from the riding fee.

Where to put the main entrance road and how to mark it with an appropriate gateway occupied the Board of Trustees off and on during the decade between 1953 and 1963. On June 22, 1953, the Executive Committee voted to proceed with a new gateway and an entrance road opposite Southerly Road. Three years later, on February 6, 1956, the committee decided that the entrance should be opposite Locustvale Road (the present location) and accepted a construction bid of approxi-

mately \$46,000. At the meeting of the Executive Committee on January 28, 1957, Chairman Davis suggested that the new gateway, like the earlier one, be named for Dr. Guth. A few months later Mr. Hideo Sasaki began his entranceway design to honor Goucher's fourth president,⁹ but when the estimated cost turned out to be \$28,485, the Executive Committee decided, on November 25, to defer its construction. The cost of this delay was considerable; by 1963 the estimated expense for the same gateway had risen to \$35,000. Fortunately, Mr. Clarence Elderkin offered to defray the expense, and on September 23, 1963, President Kraushaar informed the Executive Committee that the design of the gateway was complete and that construction would begin immediately.

Because there is no memorial tablet, most members of the Goucher community—not to mention visitors—do not know that the ashes of both President and Mrs. Guth are immured in the gateway. Mrs. Guth died on December 6, 1959, and the next day President Kraushaar reported to the Executive Committee her request that her remains and those of Dr. Guth (which had been held in mausoleum space in Druid Ridge Cemetery at the College's expense since his death) be cremated and sealed into the masonry of the new Guth memorial gateway.

In 1954, when the College still had no space to use as a theater, the Executive Committee voted, on President Kraushaar's recommendation, to convert the Barn—a building that had originally served as a garage for buses—into a temporary auditorium and a small theater.¹⁰ President Kraushaar informed the committee on September 13 that the necessary alterations were underway at an estimated cost of \$10,000 and that the finished building would be able to seat approximately 350 people. The Barn, then two-thirds completed, could already be used; the gymnasium, also ready for use, would be dedicated on Sports Day, November 6, 1954. Though not designed for the purpose, the gymnasium provided enough space to seat an audience of over a thousand and could serve for major events, such as lectures likely to draw a large group or indoor commencement exercises on rainy days. The much smaller Barn, in the words of Dr. Kraushaar, "had about it an intimacy that gave one the feeling of being very close to the lecturer or the performers." Regrettably, the building, fondly viewed by many members of the Goucher community, was destroyed by fire in the early morning of May 20, 1961.¹¹ By that time the completion of the new College Center was imminent, so the absence of adequate facilities for theater performances was relatively short-lived.

The Barn

The time had now come to make plans for completing Heubeck Hall. Because the estimated cost of the project vastly exceeded the amount allocated, only a campaign could raise the needed funds. Nevertheless, the Executive Committee decided to have Moore and Hutchins prepare preliminary drawings, with remuneration based on consultants' and draftsmen's time.¹² A little over a year later, the Executive Committee voted to proceed with construction of South House and the central portion of the hall, leaving East House to be added later. The committee

Anna Heubeck Hall



Students and callers, Heubeck Hall, 1940s

noted that this would permit “a more gradual and manageable increase in the size of the student body.”¹³ On October 29, 1956, the Executive Committee initiated the planning of East House, and on May 6, 1957, it approved the name Anna Heubeck Hall in honor of Anna Heubeck Knipp, president of the first graduating class (1892), for many years a trustee, and the co-author of the first published history of Goucher College. At the same meeting the committee named South House for Elmore B. Jeffery, a former president of the Board of Trustees; and East House for James N. Gamble, the first lay president of the Board of Trustees. This action completed the naming of all residence halls and houses already built or under construction.

On June 15, 1957, President Kraushaar informed the Board of Trustees that Heubeck Hall—with the exception of Gamble House, for which bids were still coming in—would be ready for fall occupancy. The dedication took place on October 30. By early September 1958 Gamble

House, the final unit of Heubeck Hall, was completed.¹⁴ At last the three residence halls were finished and named, and only the last hall, named to honor former Dean and Professor of history Dorothy Stimson, remained to be built.

The President's House

With the first three dormitories occupied or under construction, a residence for the president became a priority. Moore and Hutchins's original plans had been rejected by the Architectural Advisory Board in the spring of 1955; the following October the advisory board recommended to the Board of Trustees that it select another architect.¹⁵ The chosen group, Rogers, Taliaferro and Lamb of Annapolis, later announced that they anticipated completion during the summer of 1957.¹⁶

On March 12, 1956, President Kraushaar told the Executive Committee that Mrs. William T. Haebler, who had succeeded her late husband on the Board of Trustees and had given the College its stable, had contributed \$10,000 toward the cost of the president's house; in June, he further informed the committee that Mrs. Haebler, in consultation with her daughters, had expressed her wish to defray the entire cost of the house, a project in which her late husband had been deeply interested.¹⁷

The Executive Committee authorized working drawings on April 23 at a total cost of \$113,800, including landscaping and furnishings; but before it could be occupied, President Kraushaar nearly found himself with no house at all. Fewer withdrawals than had been expected forced the College, in the fall of 1956, to face the problem of lodging thirteen students for whom there was no dormitory space. President Kraushaar volunteered to move with Mrs. Kraushaar into a rented apartment so that the displaced students could live in the temporary president's house at 206 East Joppa Road. The Executive Committee expressed its deep appreciation of this offer but declined because it would cause too great an inconvenience.¹⁸ The solution turned out to be the use of guest rooms on campus, the commons room in Mary Fisher Hall, and other available space as temporary quarters for the thirteen students.¹⁹

Finally, later than originally expected, President and Mrs. Kraushaar moved into their new quarters on November 16, 1957.²⁰ The temporary house was sold in 1963 for \$104,306.77; it had originally cost \$45,155.22.

*The End of
Phase Two of
Building the Campus*

The summer of 1956 saw further attention given to physical education facilities on the campus. The Executive Committee authorized three new tennis courts on June 18, 1956, at a total cost of \$7,800, and approved the expenditure of approximately \$4,000 to resurface three existing courts. At the same meeting the committee reviewed the Fine Arts Department's urgent need for additional studio and workshop space, as well as the housing inadequacies of the Physical Plant Department. The committee decided to make the service building available to the Fine Arts Department for studio work by constructing immediately the first part of a new service compound at a cost of \$75,000 to

\$100,000. On January 28, 1957, the Executive Committee approved the location and on March 25 authorized an immediate start on construction at an estimated maximum cost of \$130,930.

Mr. Sasaki presented to the Executive Committee on October 7 a revised master plan for the Towson campus, including sites for the future auditorium, the administration building, the chapel, a proposed student activities building, and a fourth residence hall.²¹ The submission of this new master plan constituted a symbolic end to the second phase of construction in the Kraushaar era. But much remained to be built before President Kraushaar left to the College the fully developed campus that is the most visible legacy of his administration.

One of the least obvious landmarks of the final phase of campus construction—except, perhaps, to generations of students who have spent hours at hard labor in it—is the language laboratory. It first came to the attention of the Executive Committee on June 23, 1958, when President Kraushaar noted that certain alumnae, especially the class of 1903, were promoting plans for a language laboratory in honor of the professor of French whom they fondly remembered as “Sheffie.” The committee duly authorized the president to name the future laboratory for Dr. Joseph S. Sheffoe (1890–1919). On November 17 the president told the committee that plans for the language laboratory’s equipment and installation were under way; the laboratory would be housed temporarily in Mary Fisher Hall, but the intention was to move it later to a permanent location in the College Center or Van Meter Hall. At the same meeting Dean Elizabeth Geen remarked that because of the laboratory, the addition of Russian to the curriculum had become a distinct possibility. Indeed, on March 9, 1959, President Kraushaar announced to the Executive Committee a joint program with the Johns Hopkins University in Russian language and literature.²² By February 1959 fifteen language laboratory stations had been installed temporarily in the basement of Mary Fisher Hall at a cost of approximately \$12,000.²³

At its meeting on December 15, 1958, the Executive Committee assigned to the College Center priority over all other buildings and asked President Kraushaar to confer with the Architectural Advisory Board concerning the selection of an architect. Six months later the Faculty Planning Committee had completed its overall plans for the College Center.²⁴

Some years earlier the Board of Trustees had invited Mr. Pietro Belluschi of Boston to serve on the Architectural Advisory Board.²⁵ When in 1959 the Board of Trustees offered Mr. Belluschi the commission to design the College Center, he felt unable to accept because of his position.²⁶ After tentatively rejecting three other architects, the Executive Committee solved the dilemma by suggesting to Mr. Belluschi that he resign from the advisory board and accept the College Center commission—which he did.²⁷

On December 7 the Executive Committee received with enthusiasm Mr. Belluschi’s schematic plans for the College Center, and on February 1, 1960, the committee approved a budget of \$1,892,000 for construc-

tion. Preliminary plans for the center by Belluschi and by the Annapolis firm of Rogers, Taliaferro and Lamb (the associated architects Belluschi had chosen to do the drafting of plans) were approved on May 23; on June 11 President Kraushaar informed the full board that the architects were proceeding with the working drawings. With construction proceeding essentially on schedule, the Executive Committee, on December 10, 1962, received advanced information on the program of special events planned in connection with the official opening of the College Center, scheduled for January 13, 1963.

At the meeting of the Board of Trustees on June 15, 1963, Judge Thomsen announced an action taken earlier by the Executive Committee but not recorded in its minutes: the committee had voted unanimously to name the new auditorium the Kraushaar Auditorium. A concert held on January 12, 1964, provided the occasion for the formal announcement that the auditorium had been named for President Kraushaar.²⁸

Dr. Kraushaar informed the Board of Trustees on October 12, 1963, that the College Center had received the First Honor Award for architectural excellence from the Baltimore Association of Commerce and the Baltimore Chapter of the American Institute of Architects.²⁹

In 1959 President Kraushaar called to the Executive Committee's attention two new requirements for the science building: an extension needed to house radioisotopes and a large lecture-demonstration room. The latter was needed immediately because a single science course had enrolled 160 students for the following year, more than could be accommodated in any one room on campus. According to President Kraushaar, no funds were available, although the National Institutes of Health (NIH) might help with a grant of \$200,000 if the College matched it. The estimated cost of the new wing, including the lecture hall, was \$400,000.³⁰

On May 22, 1961, the Executive Committee authorized the president to engage an architect to design the extension, and on September 24, 1962, the committee approved preliminary plans by Moore and Hutchins. Increasing by approximately 40 percent the available space for the teaching of the natural sciences, this addition included a 150-seat lecture-demonstration hall, four thousand square feet of research space, a greenhouse for teaching and research, a classroom for fifty students, and a physical chemistry laboratory with adjoining instrument and balance rooms. With \$145,000 already in hand from various grants toward the estimated \$620,000 price tag, the committee authorized the architects to proceed with working drawings. A year and a half later the College received an NIH grant of \$102,789 to help finance health-related research facilities in the science building extension.³¹ Although the addition was completed by early 1965, the lecture-demonstration hall had to be postponed because of financial stringency.³²

Extension of the Science Building

On March 16, 1959, the Executive Committee discussed the possibility of raising, as part of the 75th Anniversary Campaign, an estimated \$400,000 to construct a college chapel. The committee consulted Mr.

The Chapel

Sasaki about the site and the Faculty Planning Committee worked with Chaplain Guthrie Speers on a program of specifications for the building. A month later President Kraushaar informed the Executive Committee that Marian Gift Lang, '20, had pledged \$35,000 for a chapel pipe organ to be named for her late husband, George F. Lang.³³

Soon after, President Kraushaar announced that anonymous donors had pledged \$300,000 for the chapel, provided that the College matched their gift with \$100,000; other conditions included the time of completion and the choice of architects. The Executive Committee authorized the president to deal directly with the donors' agent concerning the selection of the architect.³⁴ The donors, in concert with Mr. Belluschi and Dr. Kraushaar, approved Moore and Hutchins as architects³⁵ and eventually accepted their second design and schematic plan.³⁶ The ground-breaking ceremony took place on December 21, 1961, and in the spring of 1963, the Haebler Memorial Chapel, named for Mr. and Mrs. William T. Haebler, former trustees, was completed at a cost of \$454,305, of which \$340,000 had been donated by the three Haebler daughters. The first service was conducted on March 3, and the formal dedication followed on April 28. The chapel organ was dedicated on November 15, 1964.³⁷

Dorothy Stimson Hall

In the fall of 1959 President Kraushaar notified the Executive Committee that construction of Residence Hall No. 4 required immediate attention. This dormitory would accommodate approximately 250 students and, in a separate wing, a new infirmary. Moving the present infirmary's inadequate quarters to the more spacious wing of the new residence hall would provide space for additional students in Bacon House, and the new health facility could be amortized by instituting a separate student health fee. Dr. Kraushaar further recommended that the new dormitory be built in several stages to permit a gradual increase in the size of the student body.³⁸

The firm of Wilson and Christie of Towson was selected to design the new hall, which would consist of four houses, a health center,³⁹ and a central area; construction would go forward in stages from 1962 to 1965, when the size of the student body would increase gradually to one thousand.⁴⁰ The Executive Committee named the first house of Residence Hall No. 4 Hester Wagner House in honor of Hester Corner Wagner, a former trustee and longtime secretary of the Executive Committee, who was also a former president of the Alumnae Association.⁴¹ On January 30, 1961, the committee approved a design for stage one of the new hall, including Wagner House and a detached portion of the hall's administrative area. Expected to cost approximately \$423,320, stage one was to be ready for occupancy in January 1962.⁴²

In the fall of 1961 the Executive Committee named Residence Hall No. 4 Dorothy Stimson Hall and later scheduled the stone laying date for April 9, 1962.⁴³ The committee named the second house of Stimson in honor of Miss Frances R. Conner, '02, student counselor, then first dean of students (1922-48),⁴⁴ and the third for Grace T. Lewis, '13, dean of the A. B. Davis High School in Mount Vernon, New York, until her retirement in the spring of 1962; she had given Goucher \$35,000 for dormitory construction.⁴⁵

The Executive Committee awarded a contract for stage four of Stimson Hall on August 18, 1964. The fourth house, named for Professor Clinton Ivan Winslow (political science, 1923–62), was completed in the summer of 1965, and work went forward on the final stage of the hall, whose fifth house, named for former registrar Carrie Mae Probst, '04, opened in 1966.⁴⁶

Professor Winslow received a \$9,500 grant in early 1960 from the Educational Facilities Laboratories, a branch of the Ford Foundation's Fund for Adult Education, that provided him with released time to engage consultants and to oversee the planning of all buildings in the program stage.⁴⁷ In 1962 the College awarded him the John Franklin Goucher Medal, which had been established by the Executive Committee in 1960 to recognize distinguished service to the College. The medal was regarded as an accolade similar to that of an honorary degree.⁴⁸

A number of recreational and health facilities were added to the campus between 1960 and 1962. The first was a third hockey field, made necessary because the College had agreed to host, in the summer of 1963, the Conference of the International Federation of Women's Hockey Associations. The Executive Committee authorized the estimated cost of \$9,223 on January 18, 1960, to be secured through a special gift.

A second project began on May 22, 1961, when the Executive Committee authorized the engaging of an architect to design a swimming pool. By October 24, 1964, plans proposed by the firm of Cochran, Stephenson and Wing⁴⁹ were well advanced for an indoor-outdoor pool to be built at a probable cost of \$350,000 to \$400,000.⁵⁰

The completion of the pool became the symbol of a major triumph in this final period of construction in the Kraushaar era. Providing adequate physical resources for departments on the new campus was a problem that required attention at the beginning of the Kraushaar administration. While many academic departments were understaffed and others undoubtedly suffered from lack of adequate equipment, Physical Education was probably the only one with no space of its own to conduct its program. "Looking back," Dr. Kraushaar comments, "it seems almost incredible that in 1948 the College maintained a Department of Physical Education without facilities of any kind in which to operate."⁵¹ The fact that it functioned at all is a tribute to its entire staff, but especially to its chairman, Eline von Borries, who for years conducted the departmental activities with only those materials or locations that she could beg, borrow, or steal from other departments of the College or neighboring institutions. By exhibiting enormous patience and maintaining total integrity, she ran a Department of Physical Education under the most adverse circumstances imaginable.⁵²

"In the fall of 1967, after I had retired from my position at Goucher, Eline Von Borries and I both jumped into the new swimming pool fully clothed as a token of our emphatic appreciation of the long road we had traveled together."⁵³ The members of the audience that evening were undoubtedly shocked by our breach of decorum, but they didn't know what Eline von Borries and I knew, what only a few members of the audience could appreciate: that we had come from zero facilities to a gymnasium, dance studio, swimming pool, hockey fields, tennis courts,

Finishing Touches

and a riding stable. Goucher now offered as complete a program in physical education as any college at that time.”

We have already noted that the health center, originally planned as part of Stimson Hall, was finally constructed on its present site between Stimson and Froelicher Halls, the ground-breaking taking place on January 4, 1962. Once occupied, it freed space for thirteen additional residents in Bacon House of Mary Fisher Hall.⁵⁴

Meanwhile, Moore and Hutchins were planning the alterations in Van Meter Hall which the moving of administrative offices to the College Center made possible; the estimated cost for this project was \$71,333. The alterations ultimately included, among other facilities, thirty additional faculty offices, a large classroom, and a seminar room.⁵⁵

The Executive Committee awarded a contract on April 26, 1965, for an annex to the plant laboratory for use by the Psychology Department, at an estimated cost of \$39,440.⁵⁶

On January 24, 1966, the Executive Committee asked Moore and Hutchins for a contractual proposal for designing an addition to the Julia Rogers Library, and on April 18 the committee authorized the architects to proceed with final working drawings. A State Bond Bill for \$297,500 would cover part of the estimated \$897,000 needed for this project; the College was applying for a Federal Educational Facilities grant of \$299,000; \$63,000 on hand left \$237,000 to be raised.⁵⁷ The Executive Committee decided, on December 5, to name the new library wing for David Allan Robertson, who had died on July 15, 1961.

Finally, just before President Kraushaar's retirement, the Executive Committee chose to name the lecture-demonstration hall to be added to the science building the Louise Kelley Lecture Hall in honor of Dr. Louise Kelley (1920–59), who had served for many years as chairman of the Chemistry Department and for two years as acting dean. With this decision the committee brought to an end the extraordinary building program that spanned President Kraushaar's administration from 1948 to 1967.

E I G H T



Goucher's Remarkable Real Estate Transactions

The Goucher Board of Trustees has the rare distinction of having built two planned campuses, the first beginning in the mid-1880s, the second in the late 1930s. As a consequence of building the campus in Towson, the trustees and administration found themselves engaged in real estate transactions on a large scale. First came the need to dispose of College property in the city; then followed the gradual sale of excess land in Towson. Because not all the county acreage was required for the College's purposes, the sale of some of it represented a valuable source of income; the College relinquished other pieces of land because the State Roads Commission had plans that involved encroachment on some of the College's 421 acres. Though they overlapped somewhat in time, the sale of Goucher's downtown and county holdings will be treated separately.

On August 26, 1978, the Old Goucher College Historic District was officially entered on the National Register of Historic Places. Of the twenty-six buildings that were once part of the downtown campus, twenty-three were still standing in 1978, and of these, the eighteen shown in table 3 are listed on the National Register.

The five surviving Goucher buildings not placed on the register were the Power House and Laundry located at 2303 North Howard Street; the Headquarters for Publications and Dramatics, situated north of Ford Hall at 2323 Maryland Avenue; and three dormitories: Sess-rymner Hall, 2216-18 North Charles Street; Gimle Hall, 2217-27 North Charles Street; and Hunnar Hall, 2305 St. Paul Street.

Describing the downtown property, Dr. Kraushaar notes that Goucher had never enjoyed a true campus while located in the city. Buildings were here and there, a few in clusters, but for the most part

*Completion of the
Sale of Downtown
Property*

Table 3 Goucher Buildings on National Register of Historic Places

Address	Goucher Name	1978 Owner
2300 Maryland Ave.	Fensal Hall	U.S. Government
101 W. 24th St.	Vingolf Hall	U.S. Government
2317-23 Maryland Ave.	Ford Hall	Lewis Investment Co.
2307 Maryland Ave.	Dunnock Hall	Harry B. Cook Co.
2303 Maryland Ave.	Trudheim Hall	Harry B. Cook Co.
2301 Maryland Ave.	Folkvang Hall and City Girls' Center	Harry B. Cook Co.
2300 N. Charles St.	Glitner Hall	City of Baltimore
2327 N. Charles St.	Mardal Hall	Private residence
One East 24th St.	Alumnae Lodge	Harry B. Cook Co.
2301 N. Charles St.	Foster House	Building Congress of Bal- timore
2229 N. Charles St.	President's House	Milford A. Niles et al.
16 E. 23rd St.	Bennett Hall & Annex	State of Maryland
2401 St. Paul St.	Catherine Hooper Hall	Order of the Eastern Star
2313 St. Paul St.	Dr. Goucher's House	"2313 St. Paul St. Ltd."
2220 St. Paul St.	Goucher Hall	American Red Cross
2233 St. Paul St.	Midgard Hall	Arbee, Inc.
2304 N. Calvert St.	Alfheim Hall	City of Baltimore
2234-36 N. Charles St.	Vanaheim Hall	Private residence

Source: Goucher College Archives.

separate pieces of real estate scattered among residences and business firms over which the College had no control. The area bordered by Maryland Avenue on the west, Twenty-second Street on the south, Calvert Street on the east, and Twenty-fourth Street on the north encompassed most of Goucher's downtown buildings, which had been erected between 1886 and 1920. By 1948 that area was deteriorating rapidly. Several major buildings had already been sold; the sale of others was under negotiation. The fate of the remaining structures depended on the availability of new buildings on the Towson campus. Table 4 shows the sequence of sales of Goucher buildings in Baltimore, with their purchasers and prices.




Table 4 Sale of Goucher Buildings in Baltimore

Building(s)	Sale	Purchaser	Price
Foster House	8/29/41	Building Congress of Baltimore	\$ 7,250
Vanaheim Hall	5/18/42	Dr. Leo Schlenger	9,500
Midgard Hall	5/23/42	Federal Construction Corp.	7,500
Gimle Hall Annex	7/1/42	H. Earle Rose	5,000
Ford Hall	7/9/42	Federal Construction Corp.	14,000
Folkvang Hall, Trudheim Hall, Trudheim Hall Annex, Dunnock Hall	8/26/42	Kenneth Milford Cohen	16,000
Hunnar Hall	1/27/43	Mrs. Dora MacKane	16,000
Mardal Hall	8/2/44	Foster T. Fenton	30,000
Bennett Hall	2/11/45	State of Maryland	50,000
Bennett Hall Annex	2/12/45	State of Maryland	25,000
Fensal and Vingolf Halls	4/29/46	U.S. War Department	134,000
Gimle Hall	5/5/50	Harry Merowitz	60,000
President's House	5/5/50	Harry Merowitz	40,000
Sessrymner Hall	5/5/50	Harry Merowitz	35,000
Power House	9/6/50	Record Realty Co.	20,000
Goucher Hall	11/15/50	American Red Cross	170,000
Alumnae Lodge	12/14/50	Harry B. Cook, Co.	35,000
Alfheim House	2/25/52	City of Baltimore	132,000
Goucher House	4/30/52	United Insurance Co.	120,000
Catherine Hooper Hall	6/10/53	Order of the Eastern Star	175,000
Glitner Hall and Annex	11/10/53	City of Baltimore	175,000
Total			\$1,256,250

Source: Goucher College Archives.

One transaction that Dr. Kraushaar handled from start to finish was the sale of Goucher House, designed by the famous New York architectural firm of McKim, Mead and White, a truly historic building in the life of both Goucher and Baltimore. Situated on St. Paul Street midway between Twenty-third and Twenty-fourth Streets, this elegant, three-storied brownstone with full basement had been built and paid for by Dr. John Franklin Goucher. "A dwelling fondly remembered by the alumnae of the early years," writes Dr. Kraushaar, "when I arrived in 1948 it was in use as a student residence. No cost had been spared on this house, which still contains some of the most elegant woodwork to be found in this city, where fine craftsmanship and tasteful appointments were long a tradition.¹

The sale of Goucher House caused President Kraushaar to wonder whether the College, in light of its somewhat haphazard disposal of downtown real estate, had realized the full potential value of the property. Each building was sold as it became available and as offers came in, but there was no trustee committee to supervise and coordinate these transactions, undertaken on what amounted to an *ad hoc* basis. As a result, while there were some pleasant surprises at the revenues from the sales, there were also some disappointments. The sale of Goucher House finally led to the creation of a Land Development Committee, chaired by Mr. H. Vernon Eney, trustee and College counsel.

*Real Estate
Transactions
in Towson*

When Moore and Hutchins drew up the master plan of the campus that won the architectural competition in 1938, the surroundings of the College were mostly open or undeveloped. When Hideo Sasaki presented his revised plan in 1958, however, that situation had drastically changed. As Sasaki wrote in the "Objectives and Summary of the Plan" that accompanied his revised version:

In the period after [1938], through the pressure of the expanding urbanization of Metropolitan Baltimore, the Towson area received more than a dramatic share of growth. Goucher College is now completely surrounded by developed land. With this expansion of residential development has come the ancillary uses of commercial centers and roadways. To the south, and lying upon a part of the former "green acres" of the Goucher campus, are some of the most highly valued commercial developments of Baltimore County. To the west and the north are located Baltimore County's newest traffic arteries, and to the south and east are subdivisions of most recent construction.

It is indeed a temptation to devote a portion of the seemingly large Goucher property to uses other than those for college purposes, especially to the south. Conversely, it is indeed tempting for the County to take the College property for highway and other such uses instead of acquiring already developed or held-for-development (taxable) lands about the campus.²

Though not directly concerned with most of the real estate negotiations downtown, President Kraushaar did become involved in parallel activities in the county suggested by Mr. Sasaki. While the downtown properties were being sold, a series of developments affecting the new campus tract in Towson demanded attention. By the early 1950s the College's involvement in negotiations for the course of the new beltway contributed to its rerouting across the northern border of the campus, thereby avoiding an earlier threat that it might cut the campus in half. To the south the Hutzler contract for the erection of a complete shopping center presented problems that involved several years of negotiations. Before these matters had been settled and before a new contract for building the shopping center had been signed in the late 1950s, the College engaged in negotiations over the strip of land which the State planned for Goucher Boulevard, and soon after, the question of widening Dulaney Valley Road arose, which would also take some of Goucher's property. Furthermore, before the Campus Hills housing development was built on the eastern flank of the campus, the College conducted negotiations for an exchange of land with the Campus Hills developers. From 1950 on, there were few respite from activities concerning the development of parts of the campus that could help ease the College's serious financial problems.

*The Towson Plaza
Shopping Center*

Soon after the end of the Second World War, Vice President Clark Hobbs reported from time to time to the Executive Committee and the full board about his conferences concerning possible commercial development of the Goucher property immediately adjacent to Joppa Road.

Even at that time the increasing population of Towson suggested that real estate values would rise and that Goucher's 42.1 acres would someday be an important asset to the College. Nonetheless, it took time and lengthy negotiations to begin to capitalize on Goucher's unneeded land.

The portion of the College's disposable acreage that afforded the greatest opportunity for generating a significant annual revenue was the tract to the east of Dulaney Valley Road just north of Joppa Road. Goucher's objective was to make this the site of a large shopping center from which the College would derive a steady income as part of the "overages" from sales of the shopping center merchants. Many of the plans for the College's financial future depended on the use of some of its valuable real estate. The first step to this end was a contract with the Hutzler Company involving the outright sale of a small piece of College land lying immediately south of Joppa Road on Dulaney Valley Road, the site of an old unused inn. Included in the contract was the lease of a large tract lying north of Joppa alongside Dulaney Valley Road, a small section of which, adjacent to Joppa Road, was to be used as the Hutzler parking lot. The larger part of the tract—the portion of primary interest to the College—was to be the site of the shopping center that the Hutzlers agreed to develop and which Goucher counted on as a major source of future income.

The Hutzlers proceeded promptly to build their Towson store in the early 1950s, but they made no move to take the next step, the development of the shopping center. Although Mr. (later Judge) Roszel Thomsen, the trustee and lawyer who represented the College in the Hutzler transactions, conferred regularly with the Hutzler representatives, nothing but mild encouragement ensued. The Hutzlers, once their own store had been built, lost interest in developing the rest of the land that had been leased to them. After several years passed, the College terminated the lease, making the tract available to another firm. This lease-breaking process, that began in 1955 and concluded in 1956, was negotiated by Mr. H. Vernon Eney, a trustee and member of the legal firm of Venable, Baetjer and Howard. As chairman of the Land Development Committee, which also included Messrs. John Luetkemeyer, John Motz, and Francis Davis, Mr. Eney, a consummate lawyer, concluded the negotiations so that Goucher could lease this valuable property to a developer. In due course, the DeChiaro Company, which had previously developed Campus Hills, signed a lease, and by the late 1950s a thriving shopping center allowed the College to realize the income potential of some of its land.³

Meanwhile, as Towson's population grew, new roadways were proposed. The major project was the Baltimore beltway; the trustees had been alerted soon after the Second World War that an interstate road was planned that might require taking some Goucher land. Fortunately, the basic plan of the campus had established the axis of Mary Fisher Hall as the northern border of all but the athletic and recreational facilities; still, the College tried to influence the State Road Commission to direct the beltway's course as far north as possible to reduce its impact on the campus. On September 21, 1953, President Kraushaar informed

*The Baltimore
Beltway*

the Executive Committee that the Maryland State Roads Commission engineers had agreed to place the East-West Highway near the northern boundary of the campus, though the College would still lose a few acres.⁴

It was clear that the beltway would open the northern part of Baltimore County and make the Goucher campus far more accessible. While the College emerged well compensated from its negotiations with the highway commission, it lost, in the process, the use of Donnybrook, the glen through which the stream of the same name runs and which had served as a site for picnics and other recreational activities; the noise generated by traffic on the beltway, only a few feet away, made this formerly bucolic spot virtually unusable for such purposes. The loss also involved the land taken for the broad right-of-way of the beltway itself and a crescent-shaped tract that the freeway severed from the northern border. As it happened, the loss of the crescent was not too damaging since the College was able to interest the Towson Methodist congregation in building a new church on that site.⁵

An open tract of land, only partly utilized, is a natural temptation to institutions or agencies that might develop plans for its future. At one time county authorities apparently conceived the idea of constructing a roadway through the southern part of the campus at about the point where the Peabody Institute branch building now stands. When the Institute approached the College about the possibility of leasing land to erect a Towson instruction center, the trustees decided that the presence of some kind of structure in that general location was highly desirable; accordingly they leased a small piece of land for the Peabody building and the connection to Dulaney Valley Road.⁶

Other projects to which the Executive Committee gave close attention were the widening of Dulaney Valley Road to four lanes with a median divider, which would take approximately a sixty-foot-wide strip of land from the western border of the campus, and the extension of Fairmount Avenue to constitute the present Goucher Boulevard.⁷ The former presented no serious problems for the College, and a simple, straightforward contract concluded the negotiations. Few difficulties arose in reaching an agreement with the county on the course of the future Goucher Boulevard. By that time the College had definite plans for the commercial development of the adjacent tract, and it was clear that the construction of a roadway was needed to provide ready access to the proposed shopping center.

On February 28, 1955, the Executive Committee ratified an exchange of approximately twenty-five acres of land on the southern border of the campus in return for approximately thirty-one acres on the eastern boundary with Mr. Ralph DeChiaro. A Page fence was to be built, at Mr. DeChiaro's expense, on the east and south where the College property met the proposed housing development now known as Campus Hills.

*General Campus
Adjustments*

These roadway and commercial developments around the perimeter of the campus called for various adjustments on the campus itself. With specifications for the widening of Dulaney Valley Road in hand in 1954, the College could plan its new entrance approaching the campus from the south.⁸

As the number of visitors to the campus increased during the fifties, the College gave closer attention to the adequacy of roads, parking lots, lighting, and general security. An increase in the capacity of electrical input was a need met by the installation of a large electrical substation and transformers. Enlarged water and sewer connections followed.

What the College did not address were some of the construction possibilities proposed in the 1958 master plan by Mr. Hideo Sasaki. While most new buildings were, in fact, placed close to the locations Mr. Sasaki suggested, many of his ideas for other structures have never materialized, at least not as separate entities. These include a fine arts building placed in a cluster with the administration wing and the auditorium, the entire group of buildings to be situated slightly southwest of the present location of the College Center; a student center he proposed between the chapel and Mary Fisher Hall, but on the opposite side of the footpath connecting them; a large tract running southwest from the future Stimson Hall to be reserved for future dormitory expansion; and, south of that, close to Goucher Boulevard, a substantial area set aside for future faculty housing. Mr. Sasaki also foresaw an expansion of the library to the north, an extension to the plant laboratory, a small transverse addition to the southern end of Van Meter Hall, an addition to the north end of Lilian Welsh Gymnasium, an outdoor amphitheater in the bowled area immediately north of the parking lot adjacent to Van Meter Hall, and a nine-hole golf course.⁹



*Faculty , Students ,
and Curriculum
(1948 – 1967)*

Three successive chapters devoted to the theme of bricks and mortar, involving principally the president and the Board of Trustees, warrant a pause to consider the elements central to the purpose of the College: the academic program and the persons most concerned with it—the faculty and students.

A college curriculum, because it is subject to change, must be monitored with constant vigilance to keep it responsive to the educational needs, not only of individuals, but of contemporary society as well. At no time was this more true than during the two decades spanned by the Kraushaar administration, encompassing the Korean and Vietnam Wars, the feminist movement, the crusades for civil liberties, and the political activism of students. Obviously, the period, which included the first so-called knowledge explosion, generally cited as one of the major forces impelling curricular reform, required a willingness on the part of administrators, faculty, and students to examine new ideas and social changes and to reflect the best of these in the program of the College.

The Faculty

If the faculty in 1948 was apprehensive about the changes President Kraushaar might bring with him, its members were nevertheless ready to look objectively—though cautiously—at new ideas. They were a seasoned group, most of them (79 percent) women recruited during the twenties and thirties. Sixty-two percent were full professors, while only 21 percent were in the combined ranks of instructor and assistant professor. (Because of many retirements during the decade, a balance of 39 and 38 percent respectively was reached in 1958.)

The faculty was a remarkably cohesive group in its attitude toward the curriculum hammered out in the early thirties. While it might cynically be said that teaching positions were not easy to find in the thirties

and forties, the fact remains that most of the 1947 faculty were at Goucher because they were genuinely devoted to the College and the educational program they helped to create. They were, for the most part, excellent teachers, and some were scholars who, then or later, achieved national and international recognition in their respective fields.

Perhaps the most striking detail that emerges when we consider the composition of the faculty in the Kraushaar years is the longevity of individual members. This can be explained in part by the small amount of movement during the depression years; hardly any recruiting of new faculty occurred, and little replacement was necessary because, with few other institutions recruiting, resignations to accept positions at other colleges or universities became rare. Even taking that into account, the Goucher faculty, particularly in the senior ranks, has remained comparatively stable during the period encompassed by this history.

The Kraushaar years seem an appropriate time to review the composition and distribution of the faculty, since 70 percent of those who taught at Goucher during the period 1930–85 and who attained the rank of full professor served for at least part of their Goucher careers under President Kraushaar. (Unless otherwise noted, all the faculty mentioned in the rest of this section held the rank of professor at the end of their Goucher service, or in 1985 if still at the College.)

Looking first at the humanities, we find a good illustration of the faculty's longevity in the sequence of full professors in the Art Department. The study of art at Goucher began with Hans Froelicher (1888–1930), who, in 1895, added the title of professor of art criticism to his professorship of German literature. In art he was succeeded by Eleanor Spencer (1930–62), who was later joined by Lincoln F. Johnson (1950–85). These three careers span the entire ninety-seven-year period from the opening of the College in 1888 to the close of this history in 1985. The remaining full professors in the department—whose name changed from Art to Fine Arts to Visual Arts and finally back to Art—were



Bennett Hall fencing class, 1950



Class in Goucher Hall, 1950s

Richard Lahey (1936–60), Gretel Chapman (1962–81), Eric Van Schaack (1964–68), and the only full professor who was primarily a studio artist rather than an art historian, painter Hilton Brown (1968–78).

Music teaching began at Goucher much later than art. The first professor of music, Otto Ortmann (1942–57), started as a visiting lecturer from the Peabody Conservatory. He was succeeded by Elliott W. Galkin (1956–77), later director of the Peabody, and the distinguished composer Robert Hall Lewis (1957–).

The other two performing arts taught at Goucher, theater and dance, began life under the wing of an existing department. While speech and drama had long been taught by the English Department, the first faculty member in that department with the title of professor of speech and drama was George Brendan Dowell (1962–75). Professor Dowell was immediately followed by Barry Knower (1975–), now professor of theater and chairman of that fully independent department. Dance was brought to Goucher by Chrystelle Trump Bond (1963–), who, after serving successively as a member of the Physical Education, English, and Performing Arts Departments, is now chairman of the independent and highly successful Department of Dance.

Not surprisingly, English is second only to History in the number of full professors since 1930. As can be seen from the following list, eleven of the fourteen served during the Kraushaar administration, and four of these retired in the fifties; no one in the group was hired in the thirties.

The longevity of Goucher's English professors clearly stands out; the average length of service of the entire group of fourteen is twenty-one years; the average for the first seven is thirty-four:

Annette B. Hopkins, 1911-44
Ola Elizabeth Winslow, 1914-45
Joseph M. Beatty, Jr., 1917-58
Anna Irene Miller, 1917-52
Elizabeth Nitchie, 1918-54
Roberta Florence Brinkley, 1924-47
Rae Blanchard, 1929-54
Sara deFord, 1946-81
Virginia Canfield, 1948-64
Elizabeth Geen, 1950-68 (dean and vice president)
Sarah Dowlin Jones, 1952-81 (librarian)
Brooke Peirce, 1954-85
William Hedges, 1956-
William Randolph Mueller, 1959-73

The roster of professors of modern languages includes:

Wilfred A. Beardsley, 1919-47; romance languages
Louise Cleret Seibert, 1919-58; French
Esther J. Crooks, 1921-49; Spanish
Charles W. Lemmi, 1921-43; Italian and French
Jane F. Goodloe, 1923-52; German
Eunice R. Goddard, 1924-46; French
Lester Gilbert Crocker, 1950-60; romance languages
Enrique Noble, 1952-66; Spanish
Wolfgang E. Thormann, 1957-; French
Frederic O. Musser, 1964-; French
Rudy John Lentulay, 1966-; Russian
Sergio Rigol, 1969-; Spanish

In addition to these full professors,¹ four associate professors, each of whom taught at the College for over twenty years, deserve mention: Jeanne Rosselet (1930-58, French); Genevieve Marechaux (1960-81, French); Vlada Tolley (1962-84, Russian); and Sibylle Ehrlich (1963-, German).

Between 1930 and its termination in 1976, the Classics Department had only two full professors, Hermann L. Ebeling (1911-33) and Alice F. Braunlich (1923-53), but we cannot omit mention of one of its truly great teachers and chairmen, John Carter Williams, who came to Goucher as assistant professor in 1954 and left as an associate professor in 1968 to accept a full professorship at his alma mater, Trinity College.



Language laboratory, 1959

Although the disciplines of philosophy and religion now constitute a single department in Faculty I, for many years they were not only distinct departments but divided between two Faculties, philosophy considered as part of the humanities, and religion grouped in Faculty II with history and the social sciences. Since 1930 philosophy has had four full professors: Gertrude Carman Bussey (1915–53), one of Goucher's most memorable teachers; Raymond P. Hawes (1920–56); Mary Carman Rose (1953–81); and Joseph Morton (1963–), all of whom taught in the Kraushaar period, as did three of the five most recent professors of religion: Harris E. Kirk (1925–40), Mary E. Andrews (1926–57), S. Vernon McCasland (1928–39), Walter M. Morris (1949–71), and John V. Chamberlain (1955–).

Of the departments in Faculty II, History and the Social Sciences, the History Department stands out by having the largest number of professors in the College since 1930, and some of the most distinguished:

Thadeus P. Thomas (1892–34), whose fields also included economics and sociology and who co-authored the earlier history of Goucher

Katherine Jeanne Gallagher (1915–48)

Mary Wilhelmine Williams (1915–48)

Eugene Newton Curtis (1917–44)

Ella Lonn (1918–45)

Dorothy Stimson (1921–55) (dean 1921–47)

Dorothea E. Wyatt (1940–52)

Kenneth O. Walker (1945–74)

Anne Gary Pannell (1949–50) (dean)

Rhoda Mary Dorsey (1954–) (president since 1974)

William L. Neumann (1954–71)

George A. Foote (1955–83)

R. Kent Lancaster (1963–)

Jean Harvey Baker (1970–)

Julie Roy Jeffrey (1972–)

The Political Science Department, since 1984 called the Department of Politics and Public Policy, has had five professors since 1930, the first of whom, Clinton Ivan Winslow (1923–62), has been frequently mentioned in these pages. Professor Brownlee Sands Corrin (1952–85), first director of the Field Politics Center, became Goucher's first professor of communications in 1975. More recent arrivals include Jerome I. Cooperman (1962–80), Marianne Githens (1965–), and Lawrence Kay Munns (1968–).

The Department of Economics, now Economics and Management, has had eight professors over the last fifty-five years:

Ivan Eugene McDougle (1924–56), economics and sociology

Elinor Pancoast (1924–60)

Elizabeth Redden Fitzhugh (1945–70), economics and sociology

Frederick Gustav Reuss (1945–70)

Noel J. J. Farley (1964–71)

Blanche Fitzpatrick (1980–82)

Andre Corbeau (1980–83), management

Theodore Surani-Unger (1983–)

In addition to Professors Thomas, McDougle, and Fitzhugh, already mentioned, the Department of Sociology has had three full professors: Mollie Ray Carroll (1920–30), Olive Westbrooke Quinn (1958–80), and Alice S. Rossi (1969–74).

The remaining department in Faculty II, Education, has had seven full professors since 1930, six of whom served in the Kraushaar period:

Stella A. McCarty (1915–36)

Kathryn McHale (1920–49)

Esther Crane (1925–55)

Beulah Benton Tatum (1948–72)

Jane Morrell (1957–83)

Eli Velder (1958–)

Rolf Muuss (1959–)

Goucher's reputation in the mathematics and the sciences is ultimately based on the quality of its faculty in those disciplines, and the following lists of full professors in Faculty III since 1930 include many distinguished names. In mathematics, the seven professors have been:

Florence P. Lewis (1908–47)

Clara Latimer Bacon (1897–34)



Physiology class, 1950s

Marian M. Torrey (1925–59)

Dorothy L. Bernstein (1959–79)

Elaine Koppelman (1961–)

Geraldine A. Coon (1964–80)

Robert Edward Lewand (1977–)

Like the Mathematics and Chemistry Departments, several of whose members have been memorialized on the Towson campus (the Lewis telescope and Bacon House named for mathematicians, the Belle Otto Talbot room and the Kelley Lecture Hall for chemists), the Department of Biological Sciences is proud of the Gairdner Moment Wing of the Hoffberger Science Building. Before the Department of Physiology and Hygiene, later called Physiology and Bacteriology, was combined with the Department of Biology to constitute the new Department of Biological Sciences in 1958, the members of the department had various titles representing their particular specialties, as indicated below. Since 1958 all members have been professors of biological sciences:

Jessie L. King (1911–47) (physiology)

William H. Longley (1911–37) (botany, 1911–19; biology, 1919–37)

Ralph E. Cleland (1919–38) (botany, 1919–20; biology, 1919–37)

Ladema Mary Langdon (1920–58) (biology)

Mary Ashmun Hodge (1925–47) (physiology and hygiene)

Gairdner Bostwick Moment (1932–70) (biology, 1932–58)

H. Bentley Glass (1938–47) (biology)



Science class at microscopes, 1950s

Phoebe Jeannette Crittenden (1947–64) (physiology and hygiene, 1947–50; physiology and bacteriology, 1950–58)

H. Marguerite Webb (1952–79) (physiology, 1952–58)

Helen B. Funk (1956–78) (physiology and bacteriology, 1952–58)

Helen M. Habermann (1958–)

Ann M. Lacy (1959–)

While the list of professors of chemistry is shorter, it is no less distinguished:

Howard Huntley Lloyd (1916–58)

Louise Kelley (1920–59)

Belle Otto Talbot (1928–70)

James L. A. Webb (1959–85)

Barton L. Houseman (1961–)

Lewis A. Walker (1964–)

David E. Horn (1967–)

Physics, long independent but currently part of the Chemistry Department, has had four professors since 1930: Samuel N. Taylor (1911–33), Vola Price Barton (1919–61), M. Katherine Frehafer (1925–52), and William Richard Stroh (1962–81).

Five professors have served in the Psychology Department during the past fifty-five years: Ethel Bowman (1917–40), Annalies A. Rose (1949–60), Ruth C. Wylie (1962–82), Barbara Long (1965–85), and Jean Bradford (1966–).

Table 5 Salaries and Wages, Goucher Faculty and Other Vocations, 1953–54

Average Faculty Salaries (1953–54)		Average Salaries or Wages, Other Vocations (1954)	
Goucher Rank	Amount	Other Vocation	Amount
Professor	\$5,630	Physicians	\$15,000
Assoc. Prof.	4,667	Dentists	8,500
Asst. Prof.	4,110	Railroad conductors	6,676
Instructor	3,240	Manufacturing workers	4,051

Source: *Goucher College Bulletin III*, vol. 24, no. 2, October 1957.

Finally, Physical Education, though now a department under the dean of students, was for many years an academic department belonging to Faculty III. During that time it was chaired by two full professors, each a legend in her own right: Eline von Borries (1921–63) and Josephine Fiske (1929–70).

When President Kraushaar took office in 1948, the faculty was as well aware as he of the formidable scope of his task; changes would have to be made if the College was to maintain its status in an increasingly competitive academic world; the curriculum might be changed; faculty salaries *had* to be raised; student enrollments *had* to rise; the move to the Towson campus *had* to be completed as expeditiously as possible; good replacements for pending retirees *had* to be found. The faculty was encouraged by President Kraushaar's first priority: he began by raising salaries.

With a majority of the 1948 faculty scheduled to retire by the early 1960s, a large replacement problem clearly loomed ahead, one which required the College to increase salaries rapidly, not solely for the sake of the long-tenured faculty, but to attract the best available new teachers to replace them. When President Kraushaar took office, faculty salaries were, in his words, "atrociously low," but during the fifties they rose sharply, with material improvements in such fringe benefits as pensions and sabbaticals. By the end of the decade the salaries of instructors had almost doubled, while the salaries of full professors had risen approximately 90 percent. Dr. Kraushaar raised the issue of faculty salaries year after year in meetings of the Executive Committee.² One of his most effective techniques consisted of comparing the average figures for the four ranks at Goucher with average figures for other vocations (see table 5). A measure of President Kraushaar's success in improving salaries can be seen in the comparison of median faculty salaries for 1950–51 and 1964–65 shown in table 6.

Replacements were gradually found for retiring faculty members un-

Table 6 Median Goucher Faculty Salaries,
1950–51 and 1964–65

Rank	1950–51	1964–65
Professor	\$4,700	\$13,400
Associate Prof.	4,000	9,500
Assistant Prof.	3,350	8,000
Instructor	2,800	6,800

Source: Minutes of the Board of Trustees, June 13, 1964.

til, by the early sixties, new appointments outnumbered those dating from the twenties and thirties. The imbalance between male and female faculty members was reduced, the size of the faculty increased, and the thinness of some departments was remedied by the appointment of full-time or part-time instructors. The gradual pace of the new appointments helped the discussion about curricular changes; old and new faculty members could exchange ideas in a setting in which both felt secure and comfortable.

The Student Body

By 1947 the Goucher student body had dwindled from its 1921 peak of over a thousand to 739, the depression and the deteriorating condition of the Baltimore campus having taken their toll. For the most part students came from the eastern United States, though a fair number came from the South. Few foreign students and no blacks attended.³ Many of the undergraduates (the so-called city students) lived in Baltimore and were recruited from the two outstanding high schools for girls, Eastern and Western. Western High School sent to Goucher a significant number of its best students who, through an accelerated program (the A course), had graduated in three years.⁴ City students were almost certainly among the best in the College, but comparing the quality of entering classes is impossible prior to the requiring of the College Board entrance examinations in 1949.⁵ The quality of the student body had been adversely affected by the difficulty of having to commute between two campuses and by the paucity of scholarship funds. By 1951, however, the tide had turned. Increasing funds for scholarships, the next-to-last move of students to the new campus, and energized efforts by a new director of admissions and the alumnae to improve recruitment contributed to the change. Each year after 1951 the verbal and mathematical scores of entering students rose, partly as a consequence of the post-*Sputnik* phenomenon. On February 25, 1961, President Kraushaar shared with the Board of Trustees the following statistics concerning median aptitude test scores of entering freshmen:

	1951	1955	1958	1960
SAT-V	525	547	562	610
SAT-M	452	481	534	565

These were, of course, years in which admissions scores at the college level and the number of students admitted to graduate schools rose dramatically nationwide; the phenomenon was by no means unique to Goucher.

The increased academic quality of the student body was enhanced in 1951 by the entrance of the first early admission students. The idea of early admissions arose in 1950 when the staff of the Fund for the Advancement of Education, an arm of the Ford Foundation, was looking for new educational initiatives to support. With the Korean War looming and the threat of another military draft in the offing, the rationale of the early admissions program was to get young men started on their college careers before they were drafted into military service. The Fund's staff wanted to encourage the brightest young men to enter college after only two or three years of high school work.



Freshman bonfire, 1950s

President Kraushaar learned of the fund's plans just in time to apply for one of the first grants, and Goucher became one of twelve institutions to receive financial grants sufficient to pay full college charges for fifteen students over a two-year period, with the strong possibility of subsequent renewal. The first grant amounted to \$108,400, the largest gift to come to the College up to that point in the Kraushaar administration.

On May 21, 1951, President Kraushaar discussed with the Executive Committee the application of the grant which was intended to cover the cost of:

1. Two-year scholarships at \$1,500 each for thirty students between the ages of fifteen and sixteen and a half who had completed at least two years of high school
2. A travel allowance of \$100 for each student
3. Salary for a special guidance officer
4. A fund for publicity⁶

According to President Kraushaar, "We soon discovered that in addition to the generous financial subsidy, a strong prestige value accrued to institutions participating in the Early Admissions Program. National press coverage of the experiment was immediate and continuing, partly because of its novelty in the educational world, partly because it was one of the first grants made by the recently established Ford Foundation. Moreover, the twelve colleges on the original list read like 'Who's Who' of private colleges in the United States; and to top it all off, we were the only college for women on the list."

In 1949 the College introduced a program in elementary teacher education leading to the A.B. degree, the first accredited in Maryland, apart from the teachers colleges. In 1953, thanks to President Kraushaar and Professor Esther Crane, chairman of the Department of Education, the College increased the student body by adding the "fifth-year," a graduate program leading to the degree of Master of Education. This program was part of a national trend directed to the improvement of teaching. A grant from the Fund for the Advancement of Education defrayed the costs of introducing the experiment.⁷

The Major Restructuring of the Lower Division Curriculum

Along with the need to plan the future replacement of a large portion of the faculty, President Kraushaar saw the desirability of making adjustments in various areas of the curriculum.⁸ While some departmental restructuring and other curricular adjustments were clearly desirable, President Kraushaar recognized that this process could not be accomplished overnight; to some extent it would have to await the arrival of new personnel as the older faculty gradually reached retirement age. Meanwhile, the primary step to be taken on the presidential level was to appoint a good academic dean—which President Kraushaar did, in the person of Elizabeth Geen.⁹

The curriculum that was in place when President Kraushaar took office was a blend of the tenets of the progressive education movement and those in effect at the University of Chicago, from which both President Robertson and a number of faculty members had come. Its chief

emphasis was on an individualized education that would allow a student to progress freely through the curriculum if she could show by tests that she had the skills, techniques, and knowledge that courses ordinarily provided. Theoretically, there were no required courses.

As we have seen, eight objectives defined the goals of general education; what Dean Geen calls "their zealous guardians" were the sophomore examinations given at the end of the student's second year, though in theory she could take them any time she wished. Through these gates the student passed to the upper division and the major. A faculty Examination Board presided over the sophomore examinations, supposedly remaking the tests each year, though in reality only two alternating versions were used—a fact fairly well known by Goucher students.

The curriculum and the three-term system complemented each other in their efforts to present knowledge in depth. At its best, the curricular program within its ten-week time frame was extremely demanding in terms of frequent papers, field work, outside reading, and the almost unrelenting pace of classes meeting four times a week (in non-laboratory courses). By 1947, however, the system was sagging, unable to bear the weight of a divided campus with all that that entailed. Worst of all, perhaps, was the fact that though the Goucher library collection was available downtown, it was a bus ride away; faculty and students settled



Students in dormitory, 1950



Mary Fisher Hall common room, 1950s

for outside reading from a selection of books from the main collection carted out to the Towson campus and then carted back at the end of the term. Making the whole system work as it should was difficult for faculty and students alike.

As early as the first year of his presidency Dr. Kraushaar had raised questions about the curriculum, specifically addressing the validity of the sophomore examinations in what seemed to him their fragmentation of the unity of knowledge. He also hoped to bridge the gap between artificially separated fields by replacing the usual introductory departmental courses with interdisciplinary general education courses.¹⁰ Unfortunately, the obstacles to success were formidable. As Jencks and Riesman put it,

Administrators who hear about successful general education programs . . . often think they will be easy to establish. They *sound* easy, and sometimes cheap too, since one can presumably use existing talent instead of hiring new specialists in esoteric fields. But on closer inspection the intellectual and managerial problems of general education turn out to be staggering. One of the most serious is the recruitment of faculty sufficiently talented, both intellectually and humanly, to create courses that are genuinely interdisciplinary rather than merely additive. . . . For these and other reasons, . . . the trend seems to be away from interdisciplinary efforts at the undergraduate level and toward renewed acceptance of the value of introductory courses in the academic disciplines.¹¹

While the faculty was not yet ready to replace the sophomore examinations, they were receptive to the idea of the construction of three interdisciplinary courses funded by a \$25,000 grant from the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Advancement of Education. It took a year and all the money in released faculty time to construct the three courses, which entered the curriculum beginning in 1952–53.¹² All were highly

successful as courses, but all three were dropped after from one to five years for essentially the same reason: they could not supply the substantive material that the major departments needed as introductions to their disciplines. Moreover, since three instructors collaborated in giving each course, the cost in teaching time was three times that of the usual course, and—even more telling—the interdisciplinary offerings cut down the course repertory of the teachers themselves, since once they had prepared themselves to offer one of the interdisciplinary courses, they were saddled with it. The team-taught courses, in short, were not the best means of correcting the weaknesses of the 1934 curriculum.

As Dean Geen has pointed out,¹³ the fact that the actual reconstruction of the curriculum took four years (1953–57) should not be interpreted as an indication of faculty opposition to the changes which came gradually and fitted into a whole new scheme—a curriculum that moved progressively upward from introductory to advanced levels. The apparent slowness of the installation of the new system was the result of a deliberate policy not to push too fast when so many other changes had to be absorbed. New members of the faculty were replacing retiring professors; new buildings were becoming accustomed features of the landscape; new roads were being built; the academic departments that were thinly staffed were being merged with others related to them (for example, Economics and Sociology; Biology and Physiology). All these changes had to be absorbed and integrated into a whole which the faculty could fully accept. One telling factor that undoubtedly facilitated such acceptance was the widespread tendency on the part of young faculty in the late fifties to replicate their graduate curricula and to devote themselves to training students to become future Ph.D.'s.



Some members of the class of 1951

Before long, President Kraushaar had to devote himself to the financial and building problems that confronted him, and Dean Geen took charge of the Curriculum Committee and the reforms that emerged from it over the following decade. It seems fair to say that the frontal attack on the 1934 curriculum that led eventually to its 1958 successor began with a remarkable speech delivered to a faculty conference by Dean Geen on September 24, 1953. In her address, called "Strengths and Weaknesses of the Goucher College Curriculum,"¹⁴ Dean Geen, by highlighting the discrepancy between the ideals underlying the 1934 curriculum and the reality of its implementation, set the stage for years of effort on the part of the Curriculum Committee to improve the state of the academic program. Considering the 1934 curriculum, Dean Geen first analyzed its origins, making two essential points:

(1) The Goucher College curriculum and schedule were conceived in the image of the mature, oriented and/or honors students. I believe that the schedule at least needs to be modified in view of the fact that we have many who do not fall into any one of these categories. (2) The objectives are laudable as over-all objectives, but we need closer definition if we are to use them as controls for the Sophomore Examination and the lower division curriculum.¹⁵

As Dean Geen's critique reminded the faculty, the Sophomore General Examination sprang from the desire of the 1934 curriculum's framers to separate markedly the first two years (the lower division) from the junior and senior years (the upper division), with the latter devoted primarily to progress in the major and the former designed to insure progress in meeting the eight objectives of general education. The sophomore examination constituted the *rite de passage* between the two divisions and presented, as the faculty discovered in the mid-thirties, a formidable challenge to the committees that faced the task of formulating valid questions to measure progress towards the achievement of the very broadly stated objectives.

In the restructuring of the curriculum the sophomore examinations were crucial. To abolish them and the eight objectives at one stroke was inconceivable; they were part of a period in Goucher's history pervaded by educational ideals. So began a four year search for a substitute test: the National College Sophomore Testing program, which was far too undemanding; the College Board's Area Tests of the Graduate Record Examinations; even, finally, with the help of some College Board experts in objective tests, an attempt at making a new sophomore examination. These too failed. In 1957 a convinced faculty accepted finally what had become increasingly clear: the sophomore examinations were obsolete,¹⁶ as were the eight objectives and the set of educational mores they represented. They were remnants of a period in American education that had made an invaluable contribution, but a new and more demanding set of ideas was pressing forward to replace them.

During the years from 1953 to 1957, the quality of education nationally underwent a thorough and intense review, partly as a result of the dismal showing in tests Korean War draftees took on entering military service. The federal government and the major foundations, especially Ford and Rockefeller, began to pour money into academic conferences of various kinds designed to raise the quality of education.

Goucher's own curricular studies were thus affected by the national effort and the increase in the number of well-qualified students. College and faculty morale was high; curricular studies kept the faculty on their feet and in tune with the times.

In June 1955 President Kraushaar appointed a Special Committee on General Education whose purpose was to "develop a program in which an inherent flexibility and adaptability to the educational needs of individual students would be products of a reconciliation of freedom and control." The special committee reported to the Curriculum Committee in January 1956, proposing a program that differed from the pattern of distribution and "fiat" courses of the 1934 curriculum chiefly in its attempt to ensure progression in depth of learning and a firm foundation in the several intellectual fields through sequential courses and a system of distribution. The committee recommended an open-ended system, with exemptions from standard requirements on the basis of qualitative differences and heterogeneous preparation. It also proposed building sequential and interdepartmental courses to fulfill distribution requirements. Specifically, the committee's recommendations to the Curriculum Committee were:

I. Required Proficiencies

To be demonstrated through achievement examinations and/or successful completion of courses in the following areas:

- a. English Expository Prose (1-2 courses)
- b. Foreign Language (1-4 courses)
- c. Mathematics or Logic (1 course)
- d. Western Civilization (2 courses)
- e. Sacred Scriptures (1 course)

II. Knowledge of Materials and Methods of the Three Fields of Knowledge

To be achieved by the free election of four 2-term sequential courses, one of which should be an interdepartmental course:

Faculty I (humanities): one 2-term course

Faculty II (social sciences): one 2-term course

Faculty III (natural sciences): two 2-term courses, one in the biological sciences, the other in the physical sciences

III. Sophomore General Examinations

Discontinuance of a series of sophomore examinations in view of recommended "alternatives" I and II above.

These recommendations were debated and amended, first by the Curriculum Committee in May 1956, then by the Faculty in three meetings beginning on November 10, 1956. Ultimately, the required proficiency in English expository prose was expressed in terms of specific courses; the June 15, 1951, language requirement was left unchanged,¹⁷ the mathematics or logic and the western civilization requirements were dropped, and no action was taken on the sacred scriptures requirement since it was a Charter requirement in any case.¹⁸

Concerning the distribution requirements, the courses in Faculties I and II could be either two-term general courses or two-term sequences, and in Faculty III a two-term general course or sequence and two one-term courses or a second two-term course or sequence would be required.¹⁹

Finally, with regard to the Sophomore General Examination, the Faculty voted that the system of sophomore examinations should be retained for purposes of guidance and for securing information about the national standing of students, the tests being defined as the Area Tests of the Graduate Record Examination, a library test, and an essay examination.

On January 12, 1957, the Faculty voted that the new curriculum would become effective for the entering freshman class in the fall of 1958.

When the Faculty voted in 1957 against the use of any one of the three interdisciplinary courses as a prerequisite to an upper division course in the major, they were not only following the national drive toward higher academic demands and increased concentration on specialized fields (especially in the sciences and mathematics), they were also shaping the new curriculum whose structure was to be in accord with the progression of knowledge from introductory to advanced in all subjects—a progression applicable not only to the sciences and mathematics, but also to the social sciences and the humanities. This was an ideal whose implementation was mandated but also complicated by the contemporaneous knowledge explosion.

The curricular changes in the program of the junior and senior years were relatively simple to make since the structure of the whole was now visible, though the adjuncts of the various majors had to be examined: comprehensive examinations, independent work, and the honor system. Some remaining loose ends also needed to be tied before the logic of the whole would be realized. The time required for finishing up the work was relatively short compared to the time spent on the curriculum of the first two years.

In 1958 the Curriculum Committee began welding together the courses of the lower and upper divisions, citing the Report of the Evaluating Committee of the Middle States Association dated February 1958. The Middle States team had visited and evaluated the College in 1957, and while its report pointed to no major curricular weaknesses, it did mention a few isolated problems. Among other matters, it noted the difficulty of filling vacancies in certain fields (such as anthropology) and the thinness inherent in very small departments that were attempting, with only one or two teaching members, to offer full major programs. The evaluation team also detected, in some nonscience areas, an overemphasis on general education, sometimes at the expense of the major.²⁰ In particular, the team noted the lack of prerequisites for many upper division departmental courses.

Indeed, few courses, outside the sciences and languages, could be called intermediate. Prior to 1958 the relative failure to demand vertical course progression in the lower division made almost impossible the setting of prerequisites for supposedly advanced courses. The result was heterogeneity in the preparation of students in advanced courses, leading to excessive repetition of basic material already covered by many students or to a general lowering of the demand otherwise commensurate with the level of course difficulty. As a result, the best students were often not sufficiently challenged, nor were they prepared for the true



Members of the Operation Moonwatch Team on the roof of a building, 1957

independent work they undertook for honors. In the Curriculum Committee's view, changes were needed. Specifically, the committee recommended that "all departments immediately undertake a study of their offerings, looking toward the division of their courses into three or four levels of difficulty, with seminars, presently established or to be established, considered as the most advanced level of difficulty."²¹

The committee further recommended "that the departments, during the period of their curricular study, consider such questions as the following: Should the major include any courses below level II? What prerequisites should be set up for progression from level II to level III? How many level III courses should a major require? How many level I courses should a student be allowed to take in the upper division?"²² (At this time the only policies governing the major were the six-hour comprehensive examination, the provision that major courses ordinarily be upper division courses, and that departmental and combination majors consist of nine and twelve courses respectively.)

The committee also detected a need to curb lateral spread in the last two years resulting from the election of courses unrelated to the major and deemed easy in relation to major courses taken concurrently. This could be accomplished by supporting the major through related studies, thereby providing a focus to the election of non-major courses. (Related

studies were defined as a series of courses unified by a continuity of interest and developed by progressive exploration, the interest focused either on material considered necessary or highly desirable for the major or material which might meet particular needs and objectives of the student.) To this end, the committee proposed "that the departments consider for eventual adoption the idea of 'related' studies as an aid in the development of coherence and depth in a student's total program for the last two years."²³

The Curriculum Committee also called attention to the need for some form of general honors²⁴ so that a student with a very high grade point average could be recognized, even if she did not earn honors in the major. At the time, the only recognition of this sort was through election to Phi Beta Kappa. Moreover, the Records and Curriculum Committees together felt that nothing less than a two-term independent work project should lead to honors in the major.

To correct perceived weaknesses in the system of honors at graduation, the Curriculum Committee recommended "that the faculty accept an honors system which will allow a student to qualify for a degree *cum laude*, *magna cum laude*, or *summa cum laude* provided that she meets the qualifications listed below:

1. A student to receive a degree *cum laude* must have either a cumulative grade point average of 4.25, or a cumulative grade point average of 4.00 with an A in the comprehensive examination, or with an A in two consecutive terms of 'independent work' undertaken initially in the senior year or in the 3rd term of the junior year.
2. A student to receive a degree *magna cum laude* must have a cumulative grade point average of 4.50 in addition to an A in the comprehensive examination or an A in two consecutive terms of 'independent work.'
3. A student to receive a degree *summa cum laude* must have a cumulative grade point average of 4.50 in addition to an A in the comprehensive examination or an A in two consecutive terms of 'independent work.'²⁵

The Faculty passed these recommendations on December 12, 1959, to become effective in 1960-61, and at the same meeting it approved the rest of the cited recommendations contained in the "Report on the Educational Program of the Upper Curriculum."

Finally, the committee recommended "that each department consider requiring foreign language readings and reports on foreign language readings in the major field," the purpose being to give meaning to the language requirement; "major requirements [should] demand as circumstances allow that the foreign language the student has acquired be used in the reading she does in pursuit of her major." (It was understood that in some cases the language in which a student had relative proficiency did not readily admit use in the major.) The Faculty approved this proposal on December 11, 1959.²⁶

In its meeting on February 13, 1960, the Faculty returned to the subject of independent work and honors and voted that independent work for two terms begun in the third term of the junior year or the first term of the senior year should be called a senior thesis. It also added the phrase Independent Work to the name of the Honors Committee, which

now became known officially as the Committee on Independent Work, Honors, Fellowships, Awards, and Recommendations.

*Faculty, Students,
Curriculum*

By November 12, 1960, the Faculty had had time to reassess the levels of difficulty of courses in the curriculum, and it officially voted to establish three levels, with a corresponding system of course numbering. It further provided that during the last two years, students should ordinarily elect a total of no more than three courses at level I, and that of the nine courses constituting a departmental major, at least three must be on level III or part of the senior thesis. The same proviso applied to the twelve courses making up a combination major, with at least two of the disciplines composing the major represented in the three level III courses.

With the passage of this legislation, the attempt to correct the deficiencies of the 1934 curriculum, adumbrated in Dean Geen's speech of September 24, 1953, and pursued relentlessly by the Curriculum Committee, came essentially to an end.²⁷ The next major changes in the curriculum (other than those related to special programs, such as the College Teacher Education Program and the Non-Western Studies Program to be discussed below) occurred in 1966, when several actions were taken that seemed to reflect student concerns that largely influenced the "Report of the Committee on the Future of the College" and the major curricular restructuring it brought about in 1970.²⁸

By 1965 the political activism that had started in Berkeley had spread to practically every campus in the United States. While Goucher was never to know the violence that appeared on some campuses, it was not uninfluenced by student protests and challenges. New modes of dress and behavior enlivened the college scene; parietal rules were considerably eased, among them the one that had made it mandatory for out-of-town students to live on campus; the curriculum added courses on women's role in society; non-Western studies were widely elected; black studies were discussed. Students questioned the validity of the grading system, which they saw as a judgmental decree affecting postgraduate life and careers; this concern led to the introduction of a pass-fail option which, by easing tensions about grades, enabled a student to elect courses that would widen her intellectual interests without prejudicing her grade point average.²⁹ Presaging changes to come in 1970, the Faculty voted on June 10, 1966, to accept the recommendation by the Committee on Records that a two-year experiment, beginning the second term of 1966-67, be instituted permitting students to elect a certain number of courses on a pass-fail rather than a graded basis. Students had the first term to prepare for wise use of the plan.

Restructuring the academic program in an effort to overcome the defects of the 1934 curriculum took up much of the Faculty's time in the fifties and sixties, but many other events affecting the College's academic life occurred in the same period. The College had always made an effort to support programs that would reach out toward the different worlds surrounding it—political, economic, social, and cultural—to take advantage of the educational resources they offered to students and faculty alike. The College not only reached out, it attempted to bring in members of the community through lectures, recitals, and programs of all

*Outreach in the
Goucher Academic
Program*

kinds. One program which, though not directly a part of the curriculum, certainly drew its inspiration largely from classroom teaching was the Intellectual Country Fair. This annual event, which began in 1959 and lasted until 1978, drew a remarkably large number of community residents to the College on a Saturday in the fall to hear lectures by various faculty members on topics of both scholarly and general interest. These encounters between the faculty and the public were stimulating to both and contributed significantly to the cordial relations the College enjoyed with its neighbors.

A number of new outreach programs and opportunities appeared early in the Kraushaar years within the academic framework. One of the first was a renewed emphasis on the junior year abroad. Goucher had permitted students in the past to take their junior year abroad, but had not given strong encouragement to the program. While the 1948-49 catalogue did not mention the junior year abroad as an option, the 1949-50 catalogue included it.³⁰ Of course, this program involved little or no reconsideration of Goucher's own course of study.

A few years later, the question of the best summer use of the Goucher campus itself became a concern of the administration. In the summer of 1954, the College sponsored a Joint Economic Council Workshop for experienced teachers. Three weeks of intensive work led to three semester hours of graduate credit in education. Seven years later, in May 1961, the College announced for the following summer a German Language Institute, inspired by the successful launching of Russia's *Sputnik*, "which," according to Dean Geen, "caused us to realize the weakness of foreign language teaching in the United States."³¹ The institute, supported by NDEA funds and the only one of its kind in the Baltimore area, lasted seven weeks and was open to faculty of public secondary schools, each of whom received \$75 per week and \$15 for each dependent. (Private school teachers were eligible to participate, but without the government stipend.) The program was staffed by a director, assistant director, and instructors "who [trained] the teachers in the latest techniques of the teaching of German."³²

In the summer of 1963, also in response to the perceived need to upgrade secondary school education in the wake of *Sputnik*, Goucher offered a five-week institute in economics and sociology, funded by the National Science Foundation and open to qualified high school students; the following summer an eight-week institute for secondary school teachers of French was added. These institutes were offered for the last time in 1965.

Meanwhile, apart from the specialized institutes, the College re-established regular summer sessions for the first time since the Second World War. The Faculty voted on June 8, 1962, "that courses of at least the 200 level, with the majority, if possible at the 300 level, be offered for credit in the summer, effective 1963; in the event of approval by the Curriculum Committee of courses suitable for graduate credit, that such credit be given provided the resources of the faculty are adequate."³³ By December 1962 the curriculum for the 1963 summer session had been established, with twenty-eight courses offered, mostly at levels II and III. No laboratory courses were given, but Faculties II and III were well represented. The summer session was repeated in 1964 and 1965, but in a memorandum dated October 4, 1965, addressed to chairmen of de-

partments and heads of offices, President Kraushaar regretfully announced that because of financial losses, the summer sessions and government-sponsored institutes that had operated in 1963, 1964, and 1965 had been suspended.

In 1952 the College began an experimental, tuition-free, reciprocal exchange of students with the Johns Hopkins University, permitting certain undergraduates from each institution to take selected courses on the other campus, provided that the courses in question were not taught on the students' home campus. The program has been gradually extended over the years to include a number of other colleges and universities in Baltimore.

Some departments also extended their boundaries to take advantage of the resources offered by neighboring institutions. Eleanor Spencer, professor of fine arts, established unofficial affiliations with the Baltimore Museum of Art and the Walters Art Gallery, permitting students to pursue independent work in those art centers. Similarly, the Music Department, which took on a new life when Messrs. Sherrod Albritton, Eliot Galkin, and Robert Hall Lewis worked out a new curriculum, developed close ties with the Peabody Institute.

An eminently successful innovation, proposed by Professor Clinton I. Winslow and introduced in 1954 thanks to a grant from the Falk Foundation, was the Field Politics Center, now named for Judge Sarah T. Hughes. The Center provides students with direct experience of political reality through extensive field work and internship opportunities. The first director of the Field Politics Center was Professor Brownlee Sands Corrin; the current director is Professor L. Kay Munns.

Apart from the new programs intended for the fully enrolled undergraduates, a major innovation occurred in the sixties in the area of continuing education. While adult education began at Goucher in 1930 when the president of the Alumnae Association, Eleanor Diggs Corner, appointed the first Adult Education Committee,³⁴ the College itself did not become officially involved in continuing education until much later. The most important step in this direction was the introduction in 1964 of the Wednesday Program, an entrance corridor for women who had withdrawn from college without completing their degree requirements but later wished to finish their undergraduate education. The Wednesday Program began when Professor Kenneth Walker, chairman of the Curriculum Committee's subcommittee concerning a program for women whose formal education had been interrupted, asked for and received Faculty approval to determine possible need for such a program in Baltimore. In a memorandum to the Faculty dated May 24, 1963, President Kraushaar announced that the Charles E. Merrill Trust of Ithaca, New York, had awarded the College a grant of \$25,000, one half to be devoted to furthering Goucher's interest in the education of older women, primarily those whose undergraduate education had been interrupted but whose family situation now allowed them to consider completing their work for the B.A. degree with a definite goal in mind. A preliminary report from the Curriculum Committee suggested a Wednesday Program (Wednesday being the day when classroom space was most available), with participating faculty separately remunerated. Once established, the program would be expected to pay its own way. No competition with the existing Alumnae Adult Education Program

was foreseen since the new program would be designed to serve those who sought college credit. On the basis of this information, the Faculty endorsed the program in principle.

On May 9, 1964, the Faculty learned that the Wednesday Program had just begun with three courses: English (Professor Virginia Canfield), fine arts (Professor Lincoln Johnson), and history (Professor Rhoda Dorsey). The size of each class was limited to twenty, with a minimum of ten. Fifty-seven women enrolled, only three dropping out (for nonacademic reasons). The purpose of the program was to get these women into regular college courses as quickly as possible. The problem was how to determine when they were ready to move and at what level they should enter the regular program. A further question was what "retooling" really meant for these women, and how many Wednesday courses they should take—or be allowed to take, not to mention the problem of establishing prerequisites and sequences. Although the committee did not have answers to these problems, the Faculty voted to continue the experiment.

A report on the Wednesday Program dated July 1965 observed that during the year and a quarter of its operation, a total of ninety-three women had enrolled in the eleven courses given; six of these registrants had entered the regular program, and the innovation was paying for itself.

Thanks to strong support and guidance, the Wednesday Program flourished and was ultimately succeeded by the Goucher Center for Educational Resources (now called the Goucher Center for Continuing Studies) and its Goucher II program for women wishing to begin college at an age beyond that of the traditional college student.

Further Curricular Developments

An innovation that would later have an enormous impact on the undergraduate program resulted from a grant, successfully proposed in 1962 by Professor Dorothy Bernstein, chairman of the Mathematics Department, whereby the National Science Foundation gave the College \$20,000 to establish a Computation Center and to purchase an IBM 1620 computer. The College was required to raise \$30,000 to match the cost of the computer (\$100,000, less 60 percent educational discount from IBM) and to equip the center with supplementary calculators, air-conditioning, furniture, and other equipment.³⁵ Not only was this the beginning of Goucher's participation in the coming computer revolution, it was an action taken at such an early date that Goucher was said to be the only college of its size in the country with such a computer primarily devoted to academic purposes.

A report submitted to the Ford Foundation extrapolating Goucher's program into the following decade proposed the extension of a Goucher education into the graduate field. The idea was almost certainly introduced because of the advanced research appearing in the best of the senior theses. That the College was already offering a master's degree in education also contributed. On November 11, 1961, the faculty discussed a proposal for a five-year program in cooperation with the Johns Hopkins University leading to an M.A. in teaching. The program was intended to be for the preliminary preparation of college teachers. Sub-

sequently, the Hopkins faculty rejected such a program per se. Accordingly, on February 10, 1962, the Curriculum Committee presented for the Faculty's approval a revised "Program for the Preparation of College Teachers," whose purpose was to identify, by means of Goucher's guidance system and curricular program, highly motivated and able young women as possible college teachers and to lay the scholarly foundation for a future doctor's degree, though the immediate goal would be a master's degree earned a year after graduation from Goucher. The foundation for the program had its genesis in Goucher's experience on the undergraduate level with early admissions and advanced placement. The request to the Ford Foundation to subsidize an experimental program envisioned an alliance with selected universities that would, on Goucher's recommendation, let a Goucher applicant for admission know by January whether she was admitted, and give advanced credit or status on the basis of a senior thesis by the graduate department involved. The program embraced the following:

1. Freshman seminars, open to all freshmen but, because of their rigorous demands, likely to attract the most able, probably later selected as pregraduates
2. Programs of study for the pregraduates which, though differing individually, would all stress independent work to a more than usual degree; proficiency in two foreign languages, with high proficiency in one gained through a subsidized summer foreign language institute here or abroad; a third-level seminar, course, or independent work taken in the junior year; and a semester-long graduate course at the Johns Hopkins University (or a senior thesis) taken in the senior year and a continuation to the master's degree or its equivalent at a university³⁶

Of the twenty-one universities that had received funds from the Ford Foundation for coordinating master's degree programs similar in some respects to the one outlined above, the committee initially favored four: Brown, North Carolina, Tufts, and the University of Washington, but the committee strongly endorsed the idea that the choice of their graduate institutions be left to the pregraduates. Dr. Kraushaar said that if the Faculty endorsed the proposal, the College would apply for a grant, which would be needed for (1) recruiting able high school students; (2) scholarships for entering students; (3) freshman seminars; (4) scholarships for summer study of foreign languages; and (5) fellowships for graduate studies. The Faculty accepted the program as presented, with the intention that it be instituted, if financially possible, in 1963-64.³⁷

On May 11, 1963, Dean Geen informed the Faculty that the College had just received a \$188,000 grant from the Ford Foundation to interest young women in college teaching as a career. She further reported that the following freshman seminars, inspired by Harvard's experiment, had been established for the fall: history (1 term) by Miss Rhoda Dorsey; biological sciences (2 terms) by Miss Helen Haberman; and English (1 term) by Mrs. Florence Howe.³⁸ On May 9, 1964, Dean Geen announced that five freshman seminars had been given in 1963-64: the three mentioned above, and one each in religion and philosophy. In 1964-65 seminars would be offered in economics, political science, music, fine arts, and chemistry.³⁹ On January 8, 1966, Dean Geen re-

ported on the second year of the College Teacher Preparatory Program, noting that Western Reserve had now replaced Tufts in the agreement with Goucher and that there were forty juniors majoring in twelve different disciplines who might be looking toward college teaching.⁴⁰

The program, promising as it was, did not prosper for lack of a wider alliance with graduate institutions. Student choices of universities in which to pursue graduate work went far beyond those with which Goucher was allied.

On September 23, 1961, the Faculty was informed that the Ford Foundation's Massive Support to Colleges Program had just awarded Goucher \$1,200,000 which must be matched, within three years, on a two-for-one basis. The College, one of eight to receive such a grant at that time, would receive \$400,000 at once, the remainder dependent on the matching funds. The grant would make possible expansion of the program of non-Western studies.

On November 11, 1962, the Faculty learned that history Professor Kenneth O. Walker was chairing a faculty committee on a program of non-Western studies, which would report shortly. President Kraushaar then reviewed the various objectives of the College for the next ten years, stating that they could be partly realized with the Ford Foundation grant. Objective No. 3 was "A Program of African, Asian, Middle East, and Latin American Studies." The sum of \$100,000 had been allocated for this purpose from the initial Ford Foundation grant.⁴¹

Professor Walker announced on December 8 the institution of faculty seminars and summer fellowships for the encouragement of non-Western studies. The proposed seminars were, for 1962-63, "The Far East"; for 1963-64, "The Middle East"; for 1964-65, "Africa South of the Sahara." The seminars were to be small discussion groups of about fifteen, meeting once a week for no more than six weeks. A fund had also been established to finance nine fellowships of \$1,000 each to support faculty study in non-Western areas. The fellowships would be available in the summers of 1963, 1964, and 1965.⁴²

Professor Walker further reported that since the inception of the program, library holdings in the various non-Western cultures had been increased as a result of a special grant. Curricular offerings had also increased:

1934-50: 5 courses offered as non-Western

1950-60: 9 non-Western courses added

1960-63: 19 non-Western courses added

"The character of the faculty has been altered," continued Professor Walker. "Individuals have been appointed who have special interests in 'non-Western' subjects, but who can, in addition, teach in existing courses. Some members of the faculty have been traveling and studying abroad in these 'non-Western' areas. Seminars, to be given by outside specialists, will soon be starting. To date, there have been public lectures, recitals, and exhibitions offered. The whole program will be helped by acquiring more students from the various 'non-Western' countries to come here to study and by the faculty exchange program announced at the February 8, 1964, meeting."⁴³

It is perhaps appropriate at the end of this chapter's review of the changes in the curriculum effected between 1948 and 1967 to conclude with two observations about curricula in general. They follow naturally from what was said at the outset about the vigilance that any college must exert over all its elements, but especially over the curriculum. First, a specific college's curriculum that is under review with the objective of restructuring it eventually assumes a form that is consistent both with a pendulum-like reaction to its own immediate past and with a set of ideas prevailing in society at that particular time. The changes, interestingly enough, seem to coincide with changes in the presidency. Second, inherent in their separate existences, curricula carry the seeds of their successors. It is a wise institution that watches for the germination of the changes to come.

Conclusion



*The Alumnae Fund
and the 75th
Anniversary*

*The Goucher College
Alumnae Association*

The staggering cost of building a new campus obviously required large sums that far exceeded the normal income a college derives from endowment and student fees, and President Kraushaar inevitably found himself heavily involved in soliciting gifts and grants. The most central source of gift income on which a college normally depends is, of course, its alumnae, but to turn the Alumnae Association into a significant source of support for the College required a fundamental change in alumnae relations.

When President Kraushaar took office in 1948, the Alumnae Association regarded itself as a completely self-contained and self-directed body over which the College had no control.¹ The association undertook its own money-raising ventures, made up its own budget, paid its own expenses, and gave to the College as the Alumnae Fund whatever was left over at the end of each fiscal year. In President Kraushaar's first year at the College, the fund contribution amounted to about \$3,500, a modest sum, suggesting the major undertaking he faced in creating a better alumnae attitude toward the College. "The task," writes Dr. Kraushaar, "was made the more pleasant because the Alumnae Secretary at the time, Ethel Cockey, remained in office for many years. I quickly learned that I could always count on her to look on the reasonable side of any suggestion for change. There were other outstanding alumnae officers, such as Hester Corner Wagner, who was also the secretary of the trustee Executive Committee for many years, Mary Wilcox, Emma Thomas, and Mary T. McCurley, who had been the vocational officer of the College but retired early in my time. I met a host of alumnae leaders in various cities across the United States who were open to persuasion and also to the perception that perhaps things at the College had changed and that the antipathy between alumnae and the



Julia Rogers Library, reading area, 1960s

College engendered during the 1920s should be regarded as a thing of the past."

Before long the alumnae, particularly those in the Baltimore area, began to manifest a new spirit whose visible signs included the first Country Fair in 1949; the Friends of the Library, organized in 1949; the merger of the Alumnae Gift Building Fund with the 1950 Goucher College Campaign; the resurgence of the alumnae in such matters as returning to reunions and assisting the Admissions Office in the recruitment of new students for Goucher; and the way in which the Alumnae Office accepted relocation several times during the peak days of moving and rebuilding.

By 1954 the transition of the Alumnae Association from an independent and separately controlled body to a department of the College with a budget incorporated into the College's budget was completed. At that time the office of the Alumnae Association was on the ground floor of Van Meter Hall, after having moved successively from the original Alumnae Lodge downtown to Goucher House (also downtown), and then to the first floor of Froelicher Hall. In 1954 plans were already under discussion for the building of the Alumnae House on campus. The

alumnae, at this time, also developed a more professional attitude toward fund-raising.

The changing attitude of the association was in many ways one of the most vital developments of the early 1950s. From the few thousand dollars contributed in the late 1940s, the Alumnae Fund rose to \$367,000 by 1967, the year of President Kraushaar's retirement. To be sure, the alumnae made an exceptional effort that year, but since then the fund has realized continually higher goals, reaching its current peak of over one million dollars in 1985. Alumnae spirit, in short, was one of the strongest factors in the resurgence of the College during the Kraushaar era, thanks not only to the Alumnae Fund itself but also to the contributions countless alumnae have made to the recurring capital fund campaigns and in providing legacies for the College.

*The Campaign
for Legacies*

The remarkable growth in legacies to the College was largely the work of Judge Sarah T. Hughes,¹ to whom President Kraushaar turned for help when he began to appreciate the importance of the small bequests Goucher received early in his administration. In Dr. Kraushaar's words, Judge Hughes "was tough, she was realistic, and she commanded attention." After discussing the matter with Alumnae Fund leaders so as to interfere as little as possible with their effort, President Kraushaar asked Judge Hughes whether she would help. She readily agreed and soon sent out a strong letter suggesting that it was fitting, proper, in fact almost a duty, for Goucher alumnae to leave bequests in their wills to their alma mater. For years thereafter annual letters went out to succeeding classes of alumnae urging them to remember Goucher in their wills. While one would not expect quick results from such an undertaking, the outcome surprised and highly gratified President Kraushaar, who observes that by the late 1950s, even in years of hard fund-raising, the amount that the College received from legacies in some cases exceeded the sum raised by active campaigning.²

Thus, by the time active planning began for the 75th Anniversary Campaign, Goucher could count on continuing support, although not in predictable amounts, from four sources: the Alumnae Fund; legacies, mostly from alumnae sources; foundation grants; and corporate support.³

*The 75th Anniversary
Campaign*

The 75th Anniversary Campaign had a goal of \$5,075,000. The hope was that, as a result of the campaign, by 1965 the College would enroll one thousand students, compete for the best teaching talent with almost any other college or university, and conduct an on-campus program of cultural events for Goucher students as well as the surrounding community on a substantial scale.

Although the College engaged the New York firm of Marts and Lundy as planning consultants, the actual management of the campaign was in the hands of the newly appointed development officer of the College, Harry Casey. Despite the size of the goal—more than twice that ever attempted by the College in any earlier campaign—a good measure of confidence prevailed, thanks to a strong growth during the 1950s in annual giving, legacies, and foundation and corporate support. Above

all, the alumnae, who had not been in the habit of making large gifts to the College, now seemed ready to join in a major effort to improve Goucher's financial condition. The national campaign organization was headed by John A. Luetkemeyer, then vice president of the Equitable Trust Company of Baltimore and a valued trustee who later became chairman of the board. By this time the Alumnae Association was working closely with the administration and most directly with the College Development Office. Together, the Alumnae and Development Offices spent months identifying and training those who were to serve in leadership roles.

The campaign began auspiciously, but suddenly in the fall of 1958, on the day the College had invited two hundred outstanding corporate and institutional leaders of Baltimore City for a carefully planned campaign dinner, President Kraushaar suffered a totally unforeseen heart attack that eliminated his participation for several months. Despite his absence, the campaign went on, thanks largely to Mr. John Luetkemeyer, the national chairman, who took to the road in President Kraushaar's stead. By the time the national phase began in January 1960, the campaign had gathered sufficient momentum to raise nearly three million dollars.

By January President Kraushaar had recovered sufficiently to keep his engagement to talk from a Cleveland alumnae dinner by closed-circuit radio to alumnae dinner groups all over the country. The Cleveland dinner was well attended, but Dr. Kraushaar felt weak since it was his first engagement as a speaker to a large gathering since his heart attack. Later he began to gain strength as he visited major cities in Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, and Illinois. The way had been carefully prepared in each city for the solicitation of certain major Goucher alumnae prospects, and as a result of these direct solicitations the campaign was enriched by over \$100,000.

Although the campaign had gotten off to a strong beginning in 1957, thanks mainly to an outstanding gift of \$462,000 from the estate of Addison E. Mulligan and substantial gifts from several trustees and overseers, progress was slow through 1958 and the early months of 1959. By late April 1960, with the general phase of the campaign fully launched, subscriptions had reached approximately \$3,800,000—still far short of the goal. Serious doubts arose about the successful outcome within the allotted time: the closing date was June 30 of that year. Then, suddenly, a cluster of exceptional gifts brightened the outlook. In early May George and Elizabeth Todd of Rochester, New York, approached the College with a plan for establishing an endowment of \$350,000 for a distinguished professorship.⁴ In May Mary Baker (Mrs. William G.), a trustee who had already given \$100,000, pledged an additional \$200,000 as an inducement to others to help bring the campaign to a successful conclusion. A week later the daughters of Mr. and Mrs. William T. Haebler (two of whom had served in succession as trustees) gave a gift of \$300,000 for the construction of a chapel as a memorial to their parents. Mr. and Mrs. Hugo Dalsheimer, taking note of this upsurge of giving, pledged \$50,000 on top of an initial subscription of \$67,000, and other trustees and overseers, determined that the effort must succeed, also resubscribed to help swell the total.

Meanwhile, the rising tide of gifts from alumnae, parents, and

friends, many from former students who were giving to Goucher for the first time, and others from persons who were repeating generous earlier donations, carried the campaign to within sight of the goal by early June. All told, 62 percent of the alumnae contributed to the fund—a good omen for the future of the institution. They were, as a group, in company with Goucher parents, credited with subscriptions of over \$2,200,000, more than seven times the largest amount contributed by alumnae in any earlier campaign and more than twice the total alumnae contribution to all previous campaigns in Goucher's history.

As a result of the sudden surge over the finish line, the reunion of 1960 was a particularly joyous occasion. John Luetkemeyer announced to a record-breaking audience of jubilant alumnae that the Anniversary Fund had passed the \$5 million mark—a triumphant conclusion to three and a half years of hard work that began quietly with careful attention to leadership, planning, and organization, gained momentum slowly, and then rose suddenly at the end until it reached and passed the goal.

The success of the 75th Anniversary Campaign was particularly important in light of the frustration left over from the dragging out of the 1950 campaign. This earlier drive was intended to last two years but actually stretched out for almost four. The income from the 75th campaign made possible the completion of the campus as well as improvements in faculty salaries, scholarship resources, and the general endowment fund.

"Before the jubilation over the 75th Anniversary Fund had completely subsided," writes Dr. Kraushaar, "the Ford Foundation notified us that we were to be among the first twelve recipients of the major college aid program with a grant of \$1,200,000—if we could match that sum within two years.⁵ Harry Casey and I had laid the groundwork for that grant during the late stages of the 75th Anniversary Fund campaign. I wondered at first what the reaction of the trustees might be to the necessity of waging another matching fund campaign just after the conclusion of the 75th. Everyone had been strained to the limit; nonetheless, quite undaunted, the trustees were enormously heartened, and the matching fund was raised easily within the allotted time. Thus, in effect, the proceeds from the 75th Anniversary Fund, the Ford grant, and the matching fund made the College richer by about eight million dollars, which enabled us to plan the immediate next steps with far greater confidence than before.

"This financial underpinning of the College made all sorts of things possible, including striking advances in the physical additions to the College, most notably the College Center building which had already been envisaged in concept and whose plans were in the hands of its architect, Pietro Belluschi. During the next few years, faculty salaries advanced by substantial increments until, by 1965, Goucher stood in the upper tenth of faculty salaries of all colleges and universities in the United States as recorded in the annual reports of the American Association of University Professors. And the upsurge in scholarship resources brought about a much needed increase in minority students as well as other students unable to pay the rising college fees. In sum, the concentrated fund-raising activities, beginning in 1957 and extending into

1961–62, moved the College to distinctly higher ground in virtually every significant dimension and by every sound academic measure.”⁶

*Seventy-fifth
Anniversary Campaign*

With the approach of the 75th Anniversary Campaign, scheduled for 1960, planning began as early as 1956 for the celebration of seventy-five years of the College’s history. A committee was appointed which decided, after much deliberation and discussion, to adopt as the theme of the celebration: Human Values in the Emerging American City.⁷ “I felt happy about the choice,” Dr. Kraushaar comments. “Though Goucher had left the city and its problems behind in a physical way, we still retained a strong desire to be thought of as a part of Baltimore, especially part of the city’s urban culture. We had already begun talking about the building of a College Center, including a suitable auditorium which would invite people from the neighborhoods and the city to cultural programs of the highest order; we thought of Goucher in this respect as having a special kind of cultural responsibility to the city and its people in return for their financial support.

*The 75th Anniversary
Celebration*

“The Committee took some unusual steps to make sure that the discussion of the problem of cities would not become mired in technical considerations about architecture, engineering, urban renewal, redevelopment, and traffic handling, for it had in mind focusing on the fundamental questions of human needs and aspirations, and whether and how these could be satisfied by the emerging modern American city. Accordingly, the Committee planned a series of six seminars and invited as participants ten leaders of the Baltimore community, five members of the Goucher faculty, and five Goucher undergraduates. Each two-hour session was addressed by a speaker of national renown in city planning and urban affairs. The aim was to create an atmosphere of intimacy between the speakers and the twenty members of the seminars, with the hope of creating a situation conducive to high concentration and intense thinking.

“I had a direct and keen interest in these proceedings because I had been, since 1954, a member of the Planning Council of the Greater Baltimore Committee, made up mainly of laymen, whose purpose was to review the proposed plans of architects, engineers, and city planners for the renovation of Baltimore’s inner city, first the Charles Center area, then the Inner Harbor area. The seminars had a direct bearing on the work of the Planning Council.”⁸

The interest generated by the seminars and the two-day conference led to a variety of campus activities devoted to aspects of the general theme. “Faculty shop talks, a series of student programs on ‘Religion in the City,’ a symposium: ‘Do the Arts Need the City?’, exhibitions, competitions, book lists, lectures, group discussions, and a new emphasis on urban problems in appropriate courses in the curriculum, all contributed to shaping the sense of importance of this vital issue and increasing the intellectual vigor of campus discussion.”⁹

Once the program had run its course on the Goucher campus and in Baltimore, it was made available to alumnae leaders in other cities in an adapted form. With the help of a grant from the Fund for Adult Education, an arm of the Ford Foundation, the College assisted alumnae

leaders in ten urban centers to conduct study-discussion groups whose aim was raising the level of civic intelligence and individual participation in dealing with the changing urban environment within which people must work for the realization of human values. Another outgrowth was the publication of a book by the University of Pittsburgh Press, *Human Values in the Emerging American City*, made up of the outstanding seminar lectures, selected discussions, and an extensive bibliography.

"The nature and quality of our 75th Anniversary Celebration demonstrated several important points about a liberal arts education," concludes President Kraushaar. "First, it showed that a liberal arts college has the capacity to step outside its role of educating a selected number of students in order to grapple with an important current public question in such a way as to be a direct influence on the community in which the college resides. Second, it infused the thinking of Goucher's faculty, students, and staff with a sense of the urgency and importance of coping with the problems of urban decay and deterioration and made clear that this was indeed an appropriate object of concern for liberal education. Third, it demonstrated that Goucher College in particular, as a center of fresh thought and influence, had a sense of its special responsibility toward the Baltimore community."



C o n t r o v e r s i e s a n d D i l e m m a s

No college president who held office for nineteen years could expect to sail smoothly through nearly two decades with no storms to rock the boat, and President Kraushaar had his full share of ethical and political controversies. This chapter presents three examples: first, the question of the admission of black students to the College; next, the dilemma of whether or not the College should accept government aid, as a result of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which contained a student loan provision requiring the applicant to sign a disclaimer affidavit; and finally, the controversy that arose from what came to be known as the Chaplain's Sex Sermon.

One of the earliest ethical problems that faced Dr. Kraushaar, the question of racial discrimination against black students in terms of admission to the College, was really a sequel to a similar dilemma that had arisen in the thirties.

According to Professor Kenneth O. Walker,¹ President Robertson had been a true idealist and pioneer in the matter of ending discrimination against Jewish students. He insisted on an open admission policy that would set no ceiling on the number of Jews the College would accept. President Kraushaar continued the same policy. According to Martha A. Nichols, dean emeritus of students, at no time in her experience did the College administration ever set standards for admission on grounds other than the students' potential for academic growth. From among the candidates meeting those standards, the Admissions Committee always attempted to enroll a student population of diversity, religious and geographic.²

Like President Robertson, President Kraushaar held liberal views on the matter of racial discrimination, but when he took office, the College

*Ethnic and Racial
Discrimination*

was beset with more problems than it could handle gracefully, and he hesitated to initiate a potentially divisive controversy over the admission of a black student.

Nonetheless, the issue soon arose. One day in the fall of 1951, a well-dressed and well-spoken black woman came to the president's office and asked for a conference. She introduced herself as the mother of a daughter who would be ready for college the following fall and inquired about Goucher's policy toward black applicants. She was herself a graduate of Radcliffe College. Dr. Kraushaar told her of his sympathy for the education of black students, a matter which he had discussed extensively with the heads of the National Negro Scholarship and Service Fund, an organization devoted to gaining admission to white colleges and raising scholarship funds for deserving black students. He said that if it were his decision to make, he would certainly urge her daughter to apply, but he also cautioned her that he would have to clear the question with the Board of Trustees.

"I brought up the matter at a meeting of the full Board on October 22, 1951," writes President Kraushaar. "A very long and interesting but indecisive discussion of the question ensued. The moving spirit in the conversation was Judge Morris Soper, a highly regarded jurist who had been chairman of the Board of Morgan State College for many years.³ He encouraged a full and free exploration of the question, and most of the trustees present participated in it. Though I had hoped the outcome might be a motion to declare that Goucher admitted students without regard for race or color, that did not happen. The minutes of that meeting note—only at the very end—that 'following a full discussion, decision was deferred until such time as an application has been received.'

"When I informed the lady with whom I had conferred about the outcome of the Trustee's debate, she was understandably indignant and wrote a letter of stinging rebuke which spared neither the College, nor the trustees, nor me. As she saw the situation, we were asking her daughter to go through the entire application process for admission to Goucher College without any assurance that she would not be rejected as a Goucher student simply because she was black. The letter was a masterpiece of its kind, and I took some pleasure in reading it aloud at a meeting of the trustee Executive Committee. That rebuke made me all the more determined to cross the bridge of desegregating the College as swiftly as possible.

"Ultimately, another black candidate applied, and when I took to the Executive Committee of the Board the completed application along with the recommendation of the College Admissions Committee that the student was in every way qualified, they voted to accept her. They followed this commendable action with a recommendation to the full Board that admission to Goucher College should not be judged on a basis of race, color, or creed.⁴

"All during the fifties, recruiting the kind of young black women who could cope with Goucher's demanding academic program remained difficult for Goucher, a task complicated by the need of most applicants for full scholarship support. Scholarship funds, especially for a four-year program, were in critically short supply through most of the fifties, particularly after the Ford Foundation's early admission scholarship

funds had been exhausted. There was also keen competition among institutions for able black students. By the sixties, however, scholarship availability had improved and the situation entered into a more mature phase.”⁵

Many students were strongly supportive of desegregation in all facets of society. Some took part in demonstrations at theaters, restaurants, and stores and were frequently placed under arrest. The office of the Dean of Students soon learned to handle bail funds and to advise students on court hearings.

A dilemma confronted the Board of Trustees repeatedly in the fifties and sixties: whether or not to accept any form of state or federal aid. The trustees debated this issue as early as 1954 because they did not want Goucher, a private institution of higher learning, to accept any funds with undesirable strings attached that might lead to government direction.⁶ In a meeting of the Executive Committee on October 11 President Kraushaar raised the question of considering direct aid from the State of Maryland for new construction such as residence halls or indirect aid in the form of scholarships. He noted that several other independent schools were receiving state assistance. Mr. Walter Sondheim, Jr. and Judge Niles spoke strongly against the College’s involving itself in any way with any government agency.⁷

On October 5, 1959, however, to proceed with an essential extension to the science building, the Executive Committee approved a unanimous recommendation by a special committee on government aid to education that the president be authorized to proceed with plans for such an extension, with the understanding that the College would apply for a grant of \$250,000 from the National Institutes of Health. At the same meeting the Executive Committee decided that Goucher would not participate in the Maryland State Scholarship program because of basic inequities in the program itself.⁸ On January 4, 1960, the committee decided not to change Goucher’s stand on government aid; the College would not accept a state grant for the science building, even though such financing would insure the success of the 75th Anniversary Campaign.

The Executive Committee modified this position on September 26 when the committee agreed to borrow \$575,000 from the Housing and Home Finance Agency of the United States of America and to add \$205,000 to produce the \$780,000 needed to build the first house and the infirmary to be incorporated into Residence Hall No. 4. A month later, at a meeting of the full Board of Trustees, Mr. Vernon Eney proposed that a committee study the question of how to avoid governmental interference in the College’s affairs.⁹

By 1963 the situation had changed somewhat. President Kraushaar pointed out to the Board of Trustees on February 23 that in 1960 the trustees had agreed that Goucher should not seek state aid because the College’s promotional literature declared opposition to state aid to education. But now, Dr. Kraushaar observed, it seems “no longer a question of principle, but rather a matter of working with those forces which will aid education *without* restrictive limits.”¹⁰ He explained that the College was considering asking for a sizable grant from the Maryland State

*Government Aid
to Education*

Legislature, which had, in the recent past, made such grants to other independent institutions including Loyola College and the Johns Hopkins University. The Board agreed to authorize Mr. Luetkemeyer to proceed with a request for aid to the legislature.

On January 6, 1964, the Executive Committee approved a resolution from the Committee on Government Aid to Education to be presented to the full board on February 29. The board adopted the following resolution:

The President of the College is instructed to report annually to the Board of Trustees on faculty research activity, however financed, within the institution. He will report also on the prior year's experience with all government-aided programs.

The President will also bring to the attention of the Trustees any change in the pattern of government support which, in his opinion, may compromise the academic or financial integrity of the College.

New programs of government assistance in which the administration wishes to participate and which represent a departure from accepted patterns will be referred to the Trustees for approval.

It is the sense of the Board that it should not accept governmental support under conditions which would jeopardize the freedom of the College or to the extent that withdrawal of the support would jeopardize the program of the College.

Unfortunately, this last position could not be long maintained. Goucher, like most institutions, soon found that refusal to accept governmental support would place the institutional program in jeopardy. Some years later, Mr. Eney himself acknowledged the inevitability of this dependence on federal aid.

On February 7, 1966, President Kraushaar informed the Executive Committee that, assuming the College received one-third of the money necessary for the fine arts building, the library addition, and the science lecture hall from the federal government, the governor would ask the Maryland General Assembly to provide a state matching grant of \$510,000. On April 4 the president told the committee that the bill authorizing the grant had passed the state legislature the week before, but when the College decided to defer construction of the fine arts building, it was obliged to decline these funds.

"Being always short of scholarship and student aid funds," writes Dr. Kraushaar, "we welcomed the loan provision of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, but after we had administered it for a number of months, the dean came into my office one day and asked, 'Have you read what the students must sign to secure these loans?'"¹¹ After scrutinizing the text of the disclaimer affidavit closely, she and I both agreed that for our federal government to assume the possible guilt of students seeking loans and to require applicants to remove this assumption by signing the disclaimer affidavit was peculiar, even sinister. After all, did not farmers and businessmen receive large sums of money under various government programs without having to sign a statement attesting to their patriotism?¹²

"By this time I was also receiving some letters from colleagues at other institutions inquiring whether or not we would administer the

disclaimer affidavit; they were considering dropping the student loan program until the disclaimer affidavit was removed. After making some inquiries, I discovered about fifteen colleges that had rejected the student loan funds until such time as Congress took action to remove the affidavit. The dean and I decided, albeit with somewhat heavy hearts because we desperately needed the funds, to recommend to the Executive Committee of the Board that Goucher join them.¹³

"Soon, the media began to publicize lists of the colleges who were refusing to administer the disclaimer affidavit. Comprised largely of small liberal arts colleges with a sprinkling of public institutions, the lists included none of the big prestigious universities, such as Harvard, Princeton, or Yale. Before long, however, they, too, began making noises about the disclaimer affidavit, and more and more publicity resulted as a consequence of the growing debate. At first I feared that rejecting the student loan funds because of the disclaimer affidavit would seem to substantiate the charge that Goucher had leftist leanings. But as the controversy grew, for a college or university to appear on the list became something of a badge of honor. Eventually, their consciences sufficiently pricked by the growing protests, the Ivy League colleges prevailed on then Senator John F. Kennedy to introduce in the Senate a repeal of the disclaimer affidavit. This accomplished, we happily welcomed the student loan funds."¹⁴

The controversy that generated the most strident reactions during President Kraushaar's tenure of office did not involve politics at all; it was the commotion caused by what came to be known as the Chaplain's Sex Sermon. The College chaplain at the time was a young Episcopal clergyman, Frederick Wood. "A bright and attractive young man," comments Dr. Kraushaar, "very liberal in his outlook on all questions, including theological ones, Dr. Wood came to us at a time when many young theologians were exploring 'situation ethics.' In general and oversimplified terms, their position was that there are no absolute rules or laws governing particular behavior; they proposed that moral decisions depend upon the whole situation and how it affects the various participants in it.¹⁵ Though the young theologians' arguments with absolute morality most certainly arose from sound concerns, less sophisticated thinkers—like college students—might interpret such reasoning as a justification for the sexual permissiveness that was just then beginning to manifest itself.

"I attended Chapel the Sunday morning when the Chaplain gave the sermon that caused the prolonged controversy that involved our trustees and alumnae and furnished a prime topic for conversation in Baltimore for the next several months. I sat at the Chapel service and wondered whether repercussions might ensue. Dr. Wood regularly mimeographed his sermons, and he made no exception in this case. I wondered what would happen if a copy got into the hands of a newspaper reporter. After weeks passed I had all but forgotten the sermon; then, one day, coming home from a trip to New York, I picked up the *Evening Sun* and found a full column on Fred Wood's sermon, much quoted directly from his text. The next morning, the *New York Times* also devoted a full column to the sermon, including many quotations. For the next two months I

*The Chaplain's
Sex Sermon*

could find almost no time for my normal duties. I had to spend most of my days trying to develop ways to repair the apparent damage. Letters poured in by the hundreds from alumnae and from unknown people who berated the College for permitting such an outrage. Our clipping service brought literally bales of articles from all over the country. This went on for five or six weeks until finally the flood of mail began to abate. Interestingly we heard from people, among them a substantial sampling of our alumnae, who praised the Chaplain for speaking out so frankly on a question that is usually swept under the rug.

"The course I took, after hours of consultation with my staff and with the Rev. Guthrie Speers, our former Chaplain, was to emphasize the positive elements of the sermon. The Chaplain had tried to view the sexual conduct of young people from the perspective of situation ethics. He was saying, in effect, that while there is no absolute right or wrong in sexual matters, individuals should behave in a thoroughly responsible way with respect to all parties involved. In expounding this view, he had made statements about homosexuality, premarital intercourse, and other highly controversial subjects, clearly indicating that while he did not condemn, neither did he endorse such conduct categorically; his point was that the rightness or wrongness of moral decisions depends upon the sensitivity and responsibility exercised by the parties concerned. Perhaps because Dr. Wood was exploring new ways to understand sin, because his sermon did not present the concept of sin in traditional terms, many readers reacted to the sermon as an endorsement of total permissiveness.

"I undertook to answer every one of the hundreds of letters that were addressed to my office about the sermon. In each instance, I emphasized the positive points in the sermon and I sometimes referred to the 'new theology' which Dr. Wood represented. Sometimes my reply would prompt another letter, and I even made some converts. Finally, Guthrie Speers, Harry Casey, Martha Nichols, and I drafted a long letter that went out to all alumnae, whether or not they had written to me directly. That, of course, had the effect of bringing the sermon to the attention of those alumnae who had somehow missed the earlier publicity. On the whole, the reaction to the general letter was positive and the tide began to turn. We received notes from older alumnae saying, in effect, that when they were in college they had received absolutely no guidance in the matter of sex, a lack which they considered deplorable, and they commended the College for addressing this important matter openly.

"All the same, the worst was yet to come in the form of a dispute in the Executive Committee of our trustees. A small faction there, certainly a minority, favored clearing the air by firing Fred Wood. I defended him in every way I could on the basis of my long-standing conviction concerning freedom of teaching and expression. Furthermore, I was well aware that, if he were fired, I would have a full-scale protest by both faculty and students on my hands. Faculty and students seemed to regard the sermon as simply one approach to morality, and they took it in stride. Well liked and generally respected among the faculty, Fred Wood also enjoyed the regard of the students. The case did not involve any consideration of tenure, for Fred, by the nature of his position, was not eligible for tenure. Some trustees on the Executive Committee, however, would not let the matter rest. They kept coming back to ask what I

would do about Fred Wood. I realized that only some drastic action would quiet these critics, so I finally brought the matter to a head by stating that, if the Executive Committee succeeded in passing a motion to compel me to fire Fred Wood, my resignation would be on the table immediately. This was the only time during my Goucher years that I ever made that threat, and I made it knowing in my heart that the dissidents lacked the votes to pass a motion of that kind. I left the room while they debated the issue, but I was soon called back. That was the last I heard of the Fred Wood case at meetings of the Executive Committee.¹⁶

"As the months went by, I saw that Fred Wood's sermon had indeed done some damage. Our applications for admission were down the following year, and although other factors may have been involved, I am convinced that Goucher's image suffered somewhat in the eyes of prospective applicants and their parents. Even if this was the case, it did not last long. In retrospect I realize why. General sexual permissiveness was spreading rapidly all over the United States; by the end of the decade, the sermon which had aroused such strong reactions in the middle sixties seemed to offer rather unremarkable observations about sexual conduct. Ironically, according to Fred Wood's account, he had given the identical sermon two years earlier at Cornell University where it attracted no particular attention. I concluded that the public expected a college for women to reflect a higher standard of morality than it expected from the community in general. Any kind of scandal at a women's college, but especially one involving sexual behavior, has far more news value than the same event would have if it occurred in a large coed university or in a college for men."



Student Life in the Kraushaar Era

*The New Campus
and the Youth Culture
as Reshapers
of Goucher Traditions*

Recognizing the profound impact on student life and College traditions of the move from an urban to a “rural” campus, President Kraushaar comments in his reminiscences on this change as it shaped the lives of students during his administration. “As every architect knows,” he observes, “and as the differences between the old downtown Goucher and the new Towson campus illustrate, physical surroundings significantly affect human behavior. Downtown, students walked out the front doors of their dormitories to shops, drugstores, restaurants, but also to the hazards of high density urban living. On the new campus, they walked out of their dormitories to grassy slopes, trees, and neatly planted landscapes. During the last stages of the transition from downtown Baltimore, a few students expressed their regret at leaving the conveniences that a city can provide. On the new campus the College had to supply the facilities necessary for student recreation, social life, and entertainment that the city had previously furnished.

“Of all the constituencies of the College, the students especially felt the move. The collegiate village we all were striving to build on the Towson campus implied a degree of self-sufficiency never required on the downtown campus. I repeatedly reminded the trustees that on the new campus we had to build our own roads, our own lighting system, our own security system; we had to stock the bookstore with cosmetics, toiletries, and other supplies students had not needed from the downtown College, where stores were on the same street or just around the corner. Of course, the new campus afforded almost unlimited opportunities for physical recreation and sports, but we could realize that potential only by putting a substantial amount of planning and money into tennis courts, hockey fields, stables, bridle paths, and picnic grounds.¹ In short, the requirements of student life on the new campus



Mary Fisher Hall dining room, mid-1950s

greatly increased the role of the College as planner and provider of resources for which, in the downtown situation, it had little responsibility. Moreover, the new sylvan setting quickly put to the test old College traditions that had developed in the urban environment. Many of these survived quite unchanged for some years; others disappeared, some rapidly, some slowly.

"One of my first direct responsibilities in connection with the social life of the students required that I oversee the closing of the sororities which had flourished on the Goucher campus for many years. These organizations provided a limited but useful social outlet for their members but, unfortunately, made non-members feel excluded. Under the leadership of certain alumnae and members of the faculty (notably Gertrude Bussey, professor of philosophy), during Dr. Robertson's last years the College conducted a thorough and democratic canvass of all College constituencies to determine whether the sororities should be continued on the new campus or abolished. I should add that the sororities' physical facilities usually consisted of little more than a rented floor and a furnished clubroom in a nearby townhouse where members could meet to hold dances and parties. To fill part of the gap left by the sororities, the plan for the primary social unit in Towson featured the House, a student residence for forty to fifty students, with a residential

apartment for a faculty or staff member. Each Hall, a cluster of three to five Houses, would have its own dining room. Thus, the dormitory House became the key to the students' social life on the new campus. After experimenting with it on the old campus, Martha Nichols and Frances R. Conner could both contribute significantly to planning the House system.

"In the fall of 1948, the residential student body consisted of students living on the new campus in the four houses of Mary Fisher Hall and the first two houses of what later became Anna Heubeck Hall, and those living in downtown dormitories. Considering the circumstances, the spirit among the students was remarkably good. During the bus rides back and forth between the two campuses, they sang songs to make the trip as enjoyable as possible for themselves and the commuting faculty.

"All through the fifties the exigencies of the building program forced us to make do with inadequate space for student activities. The snack bar first occupied the 'air raid shelter' of Mary Fisher Hall until it was relocated in the College Center. Jammed into the same 'air raid shelter,' inadequate for even one facility, was the Bookstore, which subsequently moved first to the basement of the Julia Rogers Library and eventually to the College Center. Until they could make the same move, the Post Office and the Student Activities Offices functioned for many years in the basement of one of the houses of Anna Heubeck Hall.

"Providing a suitable reception area for day students remained a problem that we never solved to everyone's satisfaction. On the downtown campus, day students simply went to the buildings in which they had scheduled classes or appointments and then returned home. Because there were a number of small commercial restaurants and coffee shops in the immediate area, no snack bar was needed. With Van Meter Hall completed, a small day students' lounge—too small and, being deep inside the building, difficult to reach—proved quite inadequate.



Students in snack bar, 1957



Students in snack bar, 1960

That space later became the Computer Center once the day students' lounge in the College Center became available.

"Frequently, I heard the students complain that moving to the Towson campus established a greater distance from the men at the Hopkins, the major social outlet for Goucher students. At the time, we ran five large buses during the day and several during the evening between Towson and the city. We did our best to keep the fares low, even to the point of subsidizing them, because we realized their importance to the students in maintaining social relations with friends and for recreation and entertainment in the city.

"While this socializing pleased the students, some headaches for us ensued. Holding the line on drinking alcoholic beverages soon became a problem, one complicated because at various times state law adjusted the age limit for drinking. Although we wanted to enforce the law, to do so was extremely difficult in Towson; students could drink in parked cars or unlighted picnic areas on our large campus. Dean Nichols and I were well aware that policing such activities would be impossible, so we tried our best to make the students themselves responsible. We heard occasional rumblings, but the problem never got out of control or brought us into the orbit of a serious police investigation. In general, the students behaved well; they rarely embarrassed themselves, their parents, or the College.

"It has long been part of the philosophy of residential schools and colleges that much of the students' education takes place outside the classroom proper, and that the residential life, the participation in community activities, and the sense of belonging and of loyalty to the institution are valuable components of a college education. For that reason, we lost no opportunity to keep reminding the students of the varied elements of college life and pointing out to them that their failure to take an interest or participate in extracurricular activities would short-change



Musical group, 1950s

them. I appealed also to my administrative staff officers to involve the students more actively in student government, religious activities, clubs and organizations, class meetings, and all appropriate campus endeavors outside the classroom-studio-laboratory orbit.

“We had to work at this constantly. We revived the tradition of the boat ride to Tolchester Beach. Held somewhat irregularly in the past, this event struck me as a great way to bring faculty, students, and administrative staff together for a day of relaxation and fun. Attendance at the boat ride ranged from about two-thirds to three-quarters of the student body, rather good participation considering that the event required a Saturday afternoon and evening at an especially busy time of the year. The trip back by moonlight, usually the most spirited event of the day, included a songfest led by students. Memories of the boat rides are among my happiest of the Goucher years. We kept up this annual event until Tolchester Beach became a suburban housing development. Unable to find a suitable replacement, we abandoned the boat ride tradition in the early sixties.

“The undergraduates of the immediate post-war generation were not rebellious; in fact, the press frequently referred to them as the ‘Silent Generation.’ Goucher students did their best to sustain earlier Goucher traditions, some clearly dated and rather Victorian in nature,² others no longer useful or difficult to maintain. Some student traditions could, of course, move to Towson without significant impairment or alteration. Student government, for example, long a solid tradition at Goucher, underwent little change during the early years, although it later evolved significantly—more as a consequence of the youth culture than of the move. Similarly, the student publications notably the *Goucher Weekly*, made the move intact since their only requirement, some office space, posed no large problem. The College literary magazine, known as *Kal-*



Anna Heubeck Hall, lunch, 1950s

ends, had been replaced in 1940 by the *Dilettante*, which was supplanted in 1949 by *Venture*, itself succeeded in 1958 by *Preface*.

"Relations with *Weekly* changed rapidly as we went into the sixties. Although Mrs. Nichols and I continued our open-door policy to reporters and editors, a new tone of criticism colored articles and editorials, which reflected the changes taking place in young people's attitudes. The daily newspaper press and national magazines corroborated the changes in attitudes we noted in our students. Mrs. Nichols and I spent hours with *Weekly* reporters and editors during the early and middle sixties explaining why the College did things in certain ways, talking about our plans and next steps, and answering numerous questions, often only to discover in the next *Weekly*, when it came out, the shrill tone we had been trying to avoid. We sometimes felt disheartened when *Weekly* appeared to ignore most of what we had discussed with the student reporters and editors. By the mid-sixties I almost dreaded seeing a fresh copy of *Weekly* dropped on my desk on a Friday afternoon because of the harsh statements about the College that I had come to expect in its columns. Never personal, the newspaper attacked 'the administration.' I seldom took the editors or reporters to task for the content of these articles. I realized they were writing for the student body, not for the administration."

While the students may have become radicalized in the 1960s, they were still thoroughly Republican in 1948. A presidential straw vote, sponsored by the Political Science Club and reported by *Weekly* in its issue of October 29, 1948, showed Dewey winning in a landslide:

*Further Notes on
the Student Scene*

Dewey	261
Thomas	68
Truman	47
Wallace	46
Thurmond	12

Probably unaware of an earlier Goucher tradition concerning Norman Thomas, the writer of the lead article on the straw vote assessed his



Wheelbarrow race, Fathers' Day, 1956

strength as indicating “a sense of awkwardness on the part of the students toward the two major candidates.” The writer assumed without any reservation that Dewey would win the real election.

The *Goucher Weekly*, which had dropped the word *College* from its name in 1948, maintained in the fifties a tone and range of interests not markedly different from those of the forties,³ while *Donnybrook Fair* reached the pinnacle, winning in 1947 and 1948 the All America rating, highest award of the National Scholastic Press Association.⁴

The year 1951 witnessed the beginning of a tradition that has lasted to the present, though under a different name. What we now call Parents' Weekend began as Dad's Day, and *Weekly* made it very clear that mothers were not particularly welcome. Since students feared that some mothers would interfere with the main event—a formal dance for fathers and daughters only—the organizers of “Dad's Day” made separate provisions for them. While their husbands and offspring were gliding across the dance floor, “mothers,” wrote *Weekly* with unusual terseness, “may play bridge.”⁵

The editors of *Weekly* pursued their interest in presidential politics in the fifties, but they broke with their tradition of remaining non-partisan when, on October 17, 1952, they printed in a front-page editorial a ringing endorsement of Adlai Stevenson. Nonetheless, when the usual poll was conducted on October 31, Eisenhower won the election.⁶ With 477 voting, (306 Republicans, 169 Democrats, and two other parties receiving one vote each), the results were:

	Students (%)	Faculty (%)	Staff (%)
Eisenhower	64	49	77
Stevenson	36	51	23



Waiting in line, 1950s

Weekly continued its support of Stevenson in 1956, but conducted no straw vote.

The year 1955 was a year for singing. First, the Octet (later to become the Reverend's Rebels) was organized. Next, the College's Alma Mater, "E Longinquo," written in 1911 by William Hersey Hopkins (then professor of classics but earlier the College's first president), found itself under scrutiny. After receiving complaints based on the vocal range and Latin text of "E Longinquo," the Students' Organization sponsored an Alma Mater Songfest in the Barn on April 13, 1955. The students were to choose an Alma Mater from among five songs, of which the other four were "O Goucher Fair and True," "Juventas" (a song from Goucher's 1926 songbook), and the senior and sophomore serious songs from the most recent Sing-Song. On April 22 *Weekly* announced that "E Longinquo" had won the contest, with "O Goucher Fair and True" a close second. The Reverend's Rebels repopularized "E Longinquo" in 1980; they sang it on the lawn of the President's House—after a last-minute crash course on Latin pronunciation with Professors deFord and Musser during the picnic lunch—as part of the first celebration of one of Goucher's most recent traditions: GIG (Get into Goucher) Day. In ensuing years the "Rebs" performed "E Longinquo" frequently at commencements and other College festivities.

In 1959, on the recommendation of the Class of 1959, an older tradition underwent a wise modification: the College moved the out-

door commencement, held for many years at five o'clock in the afternoon, when spring thunderstorms are most likely to occur, to 10:30 in the morning.⁷

The major event of 1959 in student life was Goucher's competition in the CBS-TV "College Bowl," a program where students, representing various colleges and universities, competed with one another on successive Sundays in a quiz that dealt with a wide range of factual information covering a seemingly unending array of subjects, many not normally part of any undergraduate curriculum. Speed of response was of the essence. To win the "Bowl" a single team had to defeat five successive opponents in as many weeks while moving from campus to campus—a schedule not conducive to ideal academic work at home during the period in which a given team stayed alive.

Weekly announced Goucher's participation on April 24, 1959, and both the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees (through reports from President Kraushaar) and the College in general (via *Weekly*) followed the subsequent events breathlessly for the next month. Coached by Assistant Professor Rhoda Dorsey, Goucher's team won its first match in Minneapolis against the University of Minnesota on May 3; then, the following Sunday, on its own campus, Goucher beat the University of Kentucky. The team next defeated Wayne State University, but then lost the fourth match to the City College of New York. The Goucher College Bowl team had nonetheless won \$5,000 in scholarships in the course of these four weeks.⁸

When the sixties arrived, students became far more conscious of social issues, first among these the matter of racial desegregation. In 1961 Goucher students were arrested in a sit-in at a local restaurant; in 1963 nine Goucher students (with many from Morgan State College) were arrested in a protest against racial segregation at the Northwood Theatre.⁹ Activism of this kind continued through the sixties, ranging from such undertakings as the combined efforts of faculty and students who joined in the 1962 peace demonstration in Washington against President Kennedy's policy in Cuba to the establishment in 1964, under student leadership, of an interracial coffee house in East Baltimore. Meanwhile, the push for freedom manifested itself in various ways on the campus, as well as in the community. In 1967, for example, fifteen seniors gained authorization to live off-campus, with parental permission.¹⁰

Major Cultural Events at the College

Long convinced that much of the education that takes place in a good college occurs outside the classroom, President Kraushaar recognized the importance of bringing to campus men and women of the highest accomplishments in their chosen fields, not just for a formal lecture followed by a quick departure, but for a stay of two to four days. He hoped the longer visits would provide enough time for notable guests to meet informally with as many student groups as possible and give the students an opportunity to interact with celebrated scholars and artists at close range. The public lecture that the College always asked the visitors to deliver in addition to their other informal appearances was intended to edify the general public as well as the faculty and students. As a bonus, these formal lectures enhanced public relations for the

College by keeping Goucher's name in the media in connection with events of exceptional quality.

In the early part of the Kraushaar administration, before the College Center became available, the College gained considerable experience in putting on arts festivals, symposia, concerts, lectures, plays, and conferences under very trying physical conditions and in the almost total absence of proper facilities. "On the downtown campus," Dr. Kraushaar writes, "an auditorium in Catherine Hooper Hall seated approximately 1,200, but rather uncomfortably. The stage was small, so small that it could not accommodate any substantial performing group. The students managed to put on some dramatic productions, but under cramped conditions that required a large amount of adaptation and improvisation. The auditorium was satisfactory for lectures, but it became virtually useless once the entire resident student body had moved to the new campus.

"The next step—the first of several temporary measures—involved the creation of a general purpose space that seated approximately two hundred on the south end of the upper floor of Van Meter Hall. A completely graceless, minimal space, really nothing more than a large plain room, it afforded no real stage. The seating consisted of folding chairs that had to be set up and then removed for every special event. During the day, the area became two classrooms separated by a folding partition wall. Moreover, access to this room proved awkward for visitors to the campus since anyone attending a function there had to climb as many as three flights of stairs.

"With the completion of the Lilian Welsh Gymnasium in 1953, though we had a new and much larger space, we still lacked a facility designed as an auditorium or a hall for the performing arts. Still, the Gymnasium could accommodate over a thousand persons, and we used it regularly for large lectures and for Commencement exercises held indoors because of inclement weather."

As we have seen, the Barn, which seated three hundred, worked very well for smaller lectures and musical performances until it burned down shortly before completion of the College Center.

"Once the new College Center auditorium and the smaller lecture hall had become available," Dr. Kraushaar comments, "for the first time in its modern history Goucher was well equipped to mount anything from lectures to full orchestras with chorus, not to mention plays, recitals, and movies. We could also provide adequate parking for our guests, easy access to the hall, comfortable seating with excellent sight lines, and good acoustics."

In addition to improving the physical facilities for performances of all kinds, the College had to augment the financial resources available for public lectures and recitals. The catalog of 1948 listed only seven named lectureships, representing a total endowment of approximately \$40,000. Recognizing the need, President Kraushaar pursued the search for more endowed lectureships. When he left the College in 1967, the catalog listed thirteen named endowment funds for public lectures and recitals, and, even more important, the endowment for that purpose had grown to approximately \$125,000. The most notable additions during the Kraushaar years included the Elmore B. Jeffery Lectures in religion, the substantial Robertson Fund for lectures and performances in literature

and the arts, the Howard S. Nulton Fund for lectures in international affairs, the Rosenberg Fund for lectures and recitals in the arts, chiefly music, and the Stimson Lectures in history.

The number of celebrated speakers and performers from widely varied fields who appeared at Goucher during the Kraushaar era is so great that a brief list of the most notable must serve to represent the rest. Among the poets were Robert Frost, Stephen Spender, Archibald MacLeish, W. H. Auden, William Carlos Williams, Randall Jarrell, Marianne Moore, Robert Lowell, and Ann Sexton. Music was represented by Aaron Copland, Virgil Thomson, Sir Michael Tippett, and Nadia Boulanger. Visitors involved in public affairs included Dean Acheson, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and John Kenneth Galbraith. Notable among the scientists were J. Robert Oppenheimer, Harold Urey, and Carl T. Compton. From the world of academia came James Bryant Conant, Jacques Barzun, and Irwin Penofsky; theologians included Paul Tillich, Viktor Frankl, and Will Herberg. Finally, from other disciplines, three distinguished women should be mentioned: Carson McCullers, Mary Ellen Chase, and Margaret Mead—the only person to deliver two Goucher commencement addresses.




Mary Fisher Hall, prom, 1950

The young people of Goucher recognized President Kraushaar's special concern for them at the outset of his administration and honored him at the end. In *Weekly's* first issue after Dr. Kraushaar assumed the presidency, several articles indicated how much the students appreciated the considerable time and thought he had spent on student problems during his first summer at the College.¹¹ Nineteen years later, on May 1, 1967, the students again expressed their appreciation—together with that of the faculty and staff—by replacing May Day with K-Day, one of the most heartwarming expressions of College spirit in this writer's memory. To honor President Kraushaar for the last time during his tenure of office the entire College turned out to clean, paint, and generally refurbish the campus he had built and nurtured during his nearly two decades at Goucher. He, in turn, followed the perspiring but elated workers around the ring road, dispensing coffee, hot chocolate, and doughnuts. At the end of the day, President Kraushaar received a photo album depicting highlights of his administration from a grateful student body.

The Executive Committee accepted, on May 16, 1966, President Kraushaar's announcement of his retirement, effective June 30, 1967; on May 21 the Board of Trustees formed a committee to select a new president. At a special meeting on January 7, 1967, the Board elected Dr. Marvin Banks Perry, Jr., the seventh president of Goucher College. On January 21 the board named Otto F. Kraushaar President Emeritus.

Conclusion



Professor Donald Risley addressing art class, 1960s



Women for Nixon, 1960



Students at Baltimore Museum of Art, 1960s



Goucher Country Fair, 1963



Orchestra and Glee Club performance, early 1960s



Goucher Symphony Orchestra rehearsal, 1960s



Couple dancing, 1960s



Students relaxing in dormitory room, 1960s

P a r t T h r e e



T h e P e r r y
A d m i n i s t r a t i o n
(1 9 6 7 - 1 9 7 3)





*Student Activism :
The Temper
of the Times*

The six-year administration of President Marvin Banks Perry, Jr., though the third shortest in Goucher's history,¹ stands out as one of the most tumultuous and controversial periods in the annals of the College.² Because of the complexity of the circumstances surrounding it, the Perry administration poses special problems of interpretation. During these half-dozen years the College approached financial collapse—not for the first time, but now in a context complicated by concurrent events never previously encountered in the College's history, including the most widespread and violent expression of student activism ever experienced in the United States. The worldwide student upheaval of the sixties produced a turbulence from which the College could not possibly remain aloof. Partly as a result of vigorous student questioning of recently accepted but perhaps already outmoded academic traditions, Goucher restructured its governance and its curriculum in a flurry of activity reminiscent of similar faculty endeavors in 1934. Because of these interrelated events, the Perry administration remains difficult to explain or assess.

Introduction

Probably as a consequence of low morale caused by a long series of financial reversals, blame for the College's fiscal and other problems during this period was cast in many directions: at the president—the most conspicuous target; at the financial vice president, who “should have blown the whistle”; at the Board of Trustees, which did not “heed early warnings”; at the students, who displayed “anti-social and anti-intellectual behavior”; at the Faculty, who “caved in to the students”; at the national government, whose actions, active and passive, helped bring on the student revolt; at the deteriorating economy; in short, at everything and everybody “else.” To assign blame is not the purpose of these pages, which aim to present the facts without judgment—other than the obvious one that when, even in times of extreme controversy



President Marvin B. Perry, Jr., 1967-73

and change, standards are maintained, courage is shown in the face of adversity, and civility is preserved against all provocation, then some virtues have prevailed. Moreover, the facts themselves may suggest that individual blame is truly unwarranted.

Part 3 will consider, in successive chapters, the matter of student activism and the faculty and administrative responses to student pressures, the curricular and governance changes generated by President Perry's Committee on the Future of the College, the grave financial situation that developed in the Perry years, and other noteworthy events of this period not specifically related to these dominant themes.

*Prologue: National
and International
Student Unrest
from 1960 to 1970*

Because student activism at Goucher during the sixties and seventies was part of a dramatic change in student attitudes and concerns both in the United States and throughout the world, this chapter begins with a very abbreviated summary of these trends to provide a background for the behavior of the Goucher community.

Juxtaposed with the apathy and conformity that marked the Silent Generation of the fifties, the manifestation of student activism in the sixties may seem like a very modern development. We should, however, remember the St. Scholastica's Day riot at Oxford in 1354, the revolt at Harvard in 1766, and the sacking of Princeton in 1817.³ What makes the sixties so striking is not the novelty and rapid escalation of student protest, but the contrast to the preceding decade.

Student activism had taken a new turn in the thirties when, for the first time, it became associated with national politics. The depression, followed by the deteriorating international situation that led to the Second World War, added a dimension of seriousness not previously characteristic of student disorders, typically regarded in earlier years as

high-spirited, youthful pranks, however destructive their consequences. The return of the veterans after the war introduced the stoic attitude which ultimately became the quiet (or apathetic, depending on one's point of view) acceptance of the status quo that characterized American students of the fifties.

In the rest of the world, the academic scene was far less serene. Students organized to help bring about the downfall of Juan Perón in Argentina in 1955 and Perez Jimenez in Venezuela three years later, overthrew the Japanese government in 1960, contributed largely to the fall of Syngman Rhee in Korea and Adnan Menderes in Turkey in the early sixties, and participated in unsuccessful uprisings in Hungary, Poland, and East Germany. In the United States, however, students seemed to lack a sufficiently compelling catalyst to bring them to political life.⁴

In 1960 the cause emerged. The first sit-in took place on February 1, when four black students from North Carolina Agricultural and Technical College, who took seats at a segregated lunch counter in Greensboro, were promptly arrested for trespassing. Within a month, more than 300 students had been arrested for sit-ins in the South. Soon northern students—including Goucher undergraduates—were picketing public facilities and courting or experiencing arrest. Other issues of public policy also sparked protests, but desegregation, later integration, continued to act as a catalyst for students.⁵

In February 1962 the march of about 5,000 on the Pentagon, including a number of Goucher students and faculty, established the anti-war movement as another major issue of protest, but racial integration continued to be the primary basis for American student activism, especially in the South. Since many liberals viewed integration and peace as acceptable causes, prior to 1964 the press and the colleges and universities tended to lend their approval to the awakening of students from their torpor of the previous decade. That view began to change, however, when student protesters turned their attention to the universities themselves.⁶

The first major American episode in which students took violent steps to oppose an institutional policy resulted in 1964 from administrative directives at Berkeley forbidding the use of a strip of university property for soliciting funds and for planning and recruiting for off-campus social and political activities. The student response to this prohibition was the Free Speech Movement (FSM), which organized class boycotts and a sit-in in the university's administration building. The protest, during which approximately 800 students were arrested, tied up Sproul Hall for some fifteen hours, and the ensuing strike virtually paralyzed the university. The students objected to Berkeley's policy that school facilities could not be used to support or advocate off-campus social or political action, a stance which the activist students interpreted as a violation of free speech. The Regents concurred, at least in part, and on November 20 they agreed that political activity could take place on campus, provided that any *off-campus* activities resulting from on-campus planning were *legal*. The FSM saw this proviso as an attempt to prevent the on-campus planning of direct action in the community,⁷ and on December 8 the Berkeley Academic Senate supported the student position. The Regents also accepted some of the student demands, and

Chancellor Strong was forced to resign. Thus, by the end of 1964, the FSM at Berkeley had established the fact that student power was real and that direct action could be effective.⁸

By the mid-sixties activism had spread, particularly in connection with the Vietnam War. Haverford students held a drive in 1964 to collect medical supplies for the Vietcong, and in 1965 University of Michigan students "sat in" at the Ann Arbor draft board while the Michigan faculty conducted the first teach-in. In October 50,000 students marched on Washington to oppose the United States' intervention in Vietnam, and 40,000 students marched in December.⁹

Before long, local grievances related to individual campuses produced vigorous student protests: demands for reinstatement of terminated faculty members, desegregation of fraternities and sororities, an end to compulsory membership in student organizations, faculty salary increases, and other such concerns sparked picketing, sit-ins, or mass demonstrations at a number of institutions.

Soon, the new theme of student power began to emerge from these campus confrontations. The fundamental principle involved, that students should have a recognized right to determine their own affairs,¹⁰ precipitated their demands for voice and vote in policy-making bodies within their own institutions. Many colleges and universities began as early as 1964 to include students in policy-making committees, though this innovation was not fully implemented at Goucher until 1970.

Compared with other institutions, Goucher seemed relatively restrained during the explosive sixties.¹¹ Perhaps because it was a women's college, major protests involving draft deferment procedures, military recruitment, and ROTC programs were rare at a time when these issues precipitated activism at many institutions with large male populations. In 1967–68 widespread physical confrontations directed against armed service recruiters, the Dow Chemical Company (manufacturer of napalm), and the CIA took place at many institutions. But one strategy, the walk-out, introduced in 1966 at such institutions as Berkeley, Amherst, NYU, and Howard, manifested itself at Goucher when students boycotted the College's spring convocation in 1969.

*1968 and 1969: The
Student Shouts Heard
Round the World*

From New York to Tokyo, 1968 and 1969 stood out as international years of student protest. In April 1968 a peaceful dissent over Columbia University's right to construct a gymnasium on public park land and the school's affiliation with the Institute of Defense Analyses erupted into violence. The outburst led to a two-week suspension of classes, more than 600 arrests, damage to five buildings occupied by students, and the resignation of President Grayson Kirk and his vice president and likely successor, David Truman.¹² During the same period the University of Wisconsin became the scene of a bloody battle between Madison police and students occupying the university's placement offices. At San José a football game was cancelled following a threat to burn down the stadium. Four and a half months of continuous striking at San Francisco State, routine bomb threats at San Francisco and Berkeley, the killing of two Black Panthers by political rivals at UCLA, and the death of the president of Swarthmore during a student occupation of administration offices all illustrate the unrest so characteristic of the sixties.¹³



Students prepare to leave campus for demonstration in Washington, D.C., 1967

These confrontations in the United States, juxtaposed with events abroad, created a sense of global community among radicals—a development not lost on American students. Disorders in Germany followed the near-assassination of a radical student leader; several Italian campuses were paralyzed by strikes; the Events of May in Paris had widespread repercussions and nearly toppled the DeGaulle regime; casualties resulted during uprisings in Mexico City; and a sit-in involving thousands of students shut down the University of Tokyo for much of the 1968–69 academic year.¹⁴

The beginning of a new decade did not bring an end to student unrest. On April 30, 1970, President Nixon ordered American troops into Cambodia, and on May 4 the National Guard shot and killed four Kent State University students in a confrontation that shook the nation and

prompted (somewhat anticlimactically) the creation of a Presidential Commission on Campus Unrest. These events generated the first national student strike in American history: 450 colleges and universities closed.

Kent State was only the beginning. Two black students died at Jackson State in Mississippi, twelve suffered shotgun wounds at SUNY at Buffalo, nine were stabbed with bayonets at the University of New Mexico, and students burned ROTC buildings at such institutions as Colorado College and the Universities of Iowa, Ohio, Nevada, and Alabama.¹⁵

*Student Activism
at Goucher*

The themes that recur relentlessly in the *Goucher Weekly* in the first year of the Perry administration constitute a litany of the principal student concerns of the late sixties, particularly anti-war sentiments and an endorsement of black power and student power, meaning more voice in decision-making and freedom from parietal rules.

Faced with such a multiplicity and variety of student concerns, the administration succeeded in maintaining a middle course, though its efforts were not fully supported by a seriously divided faculty. While a substantial number of moderate and liberal faculty members favored a balanced response to student demands, a small group of self-proclaimed radical members lent their support to and even encouraged the more extreme student positions.

In September 1967 the major Goucher issue was self-scheduled examinations.¹⁶ In January 1968 the debate focused on the abolition of comprehensive examinations.¹⁷ A month later President Perry accepted the Students' Organization proposal to abolish the regulation prohibiting students from registering in hotels, motels, and boarding houses in the Baltimore area. (President Perry, in keeping with the administration's moderate stance, vetoed a concurrent proposal that all dormitory residents be given the privilege of having men in their rooms from 1:00 to 5:30 p.m. on Saturdays; he felt that such a measure would "cause too much invasion of the privacy of those girls who did not use the permission.")¹⁸

At the beginning of April 1968, opposition to the draft became the principal issue at Goucher, with the focus on the trial of the Rev. Phillip Berrigan et al., the Baltimore Four, accused of trying to destroy draft board records; but the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King on April 4 and the ensuing riots in downtown Baltimore that led to the calling out of the National Guard immediately dominated the consciousness and conscience of the community.¹⁹

As the spring and fall of 1968 unfolded, campus attention divided between national and local issues. At the mock political convention held at Goucher in April 1968, Eugene McCarthy won on the fourth ballot when the supporters of Robert F. Kennedy switched their support to him. (The final count was McCarthy, 130; Rockefeller, 91; Kennedy, 6.)²⁰ Meanwhile *Weekly* became increasingly strident in its advocacy of Goucher student power, emphasizing the right of students to vote on such issues as evaluation of the pass-fail system and the "Report of the Committee on the Future of the College."²¹ The shrillness of student demands probably explains the statement in the minutes of the Septem-

ber 23 meeting of the trustee Executive Committee that "while no student demonstrations are anticipated at Goucher, Dr. Perry reported that he has held informal conversations with various groups regarding possible College policies, should such situations arise."²²

At the October 21 meeting of the committee, Dr. Perry reported that "a few students have displayed interest in the dismissal of some employees working in the dormitories. These students are further interested in a union for employees, although the College pays an hourly wage well above that of the federal minimum wage and is working on an improved pension system."²³ At the same meeting President Perry noted that a student committee and *Weekly* were planning to sponsor a poetry reading by anti-war activist Daniel Berrigan, and at the meeting of November 4, Dr. Perry commented on a request from the SDS, Students for a Democratic Society, that the Goucher faculty cancel classes or engage in teach-ins as protest on Election Day.²⁴ At the same meeting the trustees discussed College policies regarding the endowment, anticipating the possibility that students and/or faculty might request the College to invest funds in some "community or humanitarian project."

Anti-establishment political views were, as we have seen, not limited to the student body. On January 31, 1969, *Weekly* reported that thirteen faculty members had formed a chapter of the New University Conference, self-described as "a national membership organization of radical scholars, students, and intellectuals."²⁵

On February 21, in response to a proposal from the Students' Organization, the Faculty considered a motion to invite students to attend the next two meetings of the Faculty as non-participating observers. After heated discussion the motion passed at the following meeting on March 8. This was the first step toward what would later become the College Assembly, the Faculty's successor as the primary legislative body of the College; the Assembly includes student representatives as full voting members.

The political stance *Weekly* adopted during this period, which happened to coincide with a visible change in its journalistic standards, finally prompted a number of students to generate a petition that the paper be denied funding from the student activities ticket and therefore forced to support itself by subscription. At the same time, a group of students announced plans to publish an alternative paper, *Echo*, which, they said, would be "an informative, 'community' newspaper that is 'campus-oriented.'"²⁶ *Echo* did, in fact, begin publication on May 20, and three issues appeared before the end of the academic year.²⁷ Nevertheless, citing lack of student support, *Echo* ceased publication after its third issue. A year later, on May 22, 1970, also claiming lack of support, *Weekly* ceased publication for the rest of the spring and the following term, leaving the College with no newspaper for the fall of 1970. To help fill the gap, the College administration published *Channels*, distributed twice a month until *Weekly* finally resumed publication during the second semester of 1970-71.

One of the most explosive issues on the Goucher campus during these years involved the attempt by the class of 1969, one month before its scheduled graduation, to avoid taking comprehensive examinations, an effort supported by underclassmen who anticipated the same academic confrontation later on. The minutes of the Faculty meeting of May 10

record that history Professor Lee Lowenfish read a petition signed by about 520 students which said: "We, the undersigned, feel that senior comprehensives should not be a requirement for graduation. We also feel that each department, with the approval of its junior and senior majors (or representatives), should be left to decide the form of its comprehensives and whether its seniors should be required to take them." Mr. Lowenfish moved that, pending a summer study of the question of comprehensives and a discussion beginning with the first fall faculty meeting, the status of comprehensive examinations as a degree requirement be suspended for the class of 1969. Supported by an opinion of the Faculty parliamentarian, the Chair ruled that the motion was out of order since the rules of procedure did not allow the suspension of legislation. Spanish Professor Alfredo Matilla then moved that senior comprehensive examinations be abolished as a requirement for graduation. A motion to table Mr. Matilla's motion was adopted.

On May 16 *Weekly* summarized the current situation.

The President's Council has called a faculty meeting today at 1:00 in response to a student petition for the abolition of comprehensives as a requirement for graduation this year. Over 800 students and several faculty and administrators attended an open meeting on Tuesday, May 13, to discuss the petition after a similar petition signed by approximately 700 students was tabled at the faculty meeting last Saturday, May 10.²⁸ The second petition, signed by 925 students, states: "We request that an experiment be initiated commencing with the class of 1969 which will free graduation from dependence on the results of the senior comprehensive exams. The effect of this experiment will be evaluated and reported on at the second fall faculty meeting. We request that enough faculty meetings be held between now and comps so that this experiment can be put into effect."

The reason behind the petition was then explained by Barbara Safriet, past president of Student Org. She indicated that [the question was] whether the comps ought to be required for graduation when there are "inequalities between departments in giving comps" and when "everyone must successfully complete comps before graduation." Safriet observed that some seniors have prepared comps, some have semi-prepared ones, while other seniors have no idea what will be included in theirs. She added that the College was placing more value on a six-hour test than on four years of learning. Safriet emphasized that the consensus of the curriculum committee report last year indicated that comps were "academically unsatisfactory in their present form."

At the Faculty meeting on May 16, a motion to remove Mr. Matilla's motion from the table was defeated by a vote of 49 to 25. Dean Rhoda Dorsey then moved adoption of a resolution from the Curriculum Committee which recognized the deep student concern about comprehensive examinations and assured the students that an *ad hoc* committee would be charged with making recommendations with regard to comprehensive examinations no later than the end of the first term of 1969-70, and further promised the students that the Faculty would take prompt action on these recommendations; the resolution made clear, however, that the Faculty considered taking any action involving a change in degree requirements for the class of 1969 inadvisable so late in the year. This resolution passed by a vote of 53 to 15 with one abstention.

Following these actions on the part of the Faculty, a majority of the

students decided that, under the circumstances, to participate in the honors convocation ceremonies that were scheduled for May 20 would be inappropriate. With the prior knowledge of the administration, the presidents of the senior class and of the Students' Organization read brief statements from the stage of Kraushaar Auditorium. The first statement, by Gail Anderson, follows:

I stand here today as permanent president of the class of 1969 and representative of those seniors who have chosen not to attend this Honors Convocation. We do earnestly and with all due respect believe that to hold an Honors Convocation in our academic community would be meaningless. We hold this belief not only because the petition of 925 people was ignored, but also because of the dissension and factionalism which has precluded a clear, reasoned statement from the faculty on the issue that concerns all of us. We believe that this factionalism has emerged as a result of a loss of trust among faculty and students. As seniors who have known and respected our faculty for four years, we are now disillusioned and disappointed by those persons who have questioned our integrity and intellectual capabilities, and yet have themselves abandoned their own personal and professional integrity. To receive honors at the hands of our faculty at this time would be inappropriate.

We members of the class of 1969 will hold our own Convocation in Haebler Memorial Chapel after this statement has been read. This convocation we feel will be both honorable and meaningful.

The second statement, by Lucretia Mott Gibbs, president of the Students' Organization, follows:

We feel that an educational assembly at this time on this campus is invalid. The faculty, with some exceptions, has violated its role as a professional educator in its failure to respond to a valid question, submitted by 925 students, and in its manipulation of an open question into a temporary dead end. As students who have been unjustly accused by the faculty of being coerced and using coercive measures to effectively articulate a question, and who have subsequently been ignored and insulted, again by a faculty which is reponsible to us as an educator, we cannot take part in this educational assembly.²⁹

After the reading of these statements, those students who participated in the walk-out marched to the Haebler Memorial Chapel where they proceeded to hold their own honors convocation.³⁰ The faculty was hurt by the students' vituperative reaction to what the majority considered an appropriate response to a demand for precipitous action, one that would have changed the degree requirements of a particular class only a few weeks prior to their graduation. Nonetheless, when the matter was reconsidered the following year in a less emotionally charged atmosphere, the faculty voted to abolish the comprehensive examinations as a degree requirement beginning with the class of 1970 and to replace them with an integrative exercise.

When a group of students asked President Perry to close the College in connection with the proposed October 15 [1969] moratorium on the Vietnam War, he replied that, while he personally opposed the war, he also opposed any attempt to close the College.³¹ At the October 25 meeting of the Board of Trustees, Dr. Perry reported with pleasure that only a few students and faculty members had asked him to close the College, a request he had denied. He emphasized his "tempered opti-

mism" that "Goucher's pressing problems can be solved if all the resources of the College community are employed to achieve change which reflects clear thinking, responsible commitment, and the conviction that the College is not a political vehicle."³²

The administration's position that the College should not, as an institution, adopt political positions was severely tested. On April 30, 1970, the Nixon administration decided to send U.S. troops to Cambodia; four days later, four students died at Kent State University during a student protest. When the Faculty met in special session on May 5, it voted against cancelling classes on May 7 in support of the Goucher Strike,³³ a proposed demonstration intended to protest the Cambodian invasion and the Kent State killings and organized as part of a national student strike against the war. In a memorandum to "The Goucher Community," President Perry reported that at its May 5 meeting, by a vote of 29 to 28 with six abstentions (a vote indicative of how divided the body was), the Faculty had expressed "its deep dismay over the expansion of the war in South East Asia" and requested the president "to declare Thursday, May 7, a College day of mourning for those killed this week in the United States and in Asia because of that expansion." Dr. Perry's memo continues:

Accordingly, I urge members of the Goucher Community to follow their individual consciences in observing this day in any appropriate manner. As the President of the College, I will not cancel Goucher classes and other College activities, but those students whose consciences urge them to forego their regular academic duties on this day are free, as they have long been at Goucher, to follow their consciences in such matters. Similarly, all those who wish to express their feelings without interrupting their educational commitments are free to do so.

While most of the faculty dutifully appeared for their classes, only a few students followed suit. A majority of the absentees demonstrated in Washington.

On May 16 in response to a student referendum in which more than half the student body supported the introduction of temporary grading options, applicable to the spring term of 1970 and intended to allow students who so wished to "work for peace," the Faculty approved the following four options:

1. Complete any or all courses as usual
2. Take any or all courses pass-fail, with any excess over the normal allowance not affecting the allowance for the following year
3. Take an incomplete in any or all courses with twelve months to complete (with permission of the instructor and the dean, as usual)
4. Withdraw from any or all courses up to the time of the final examination without penalty³⁴

It should be noted that in most of these actions Goucher followed the lead of other institutions, just as Goucher students imitated the stances of students at other colleges and universities.

On May 13 President Perry reported to the Executive Committee on the current state of affairs at the College and announced a plan to

present, in place of the customary honors convocation, a convocation concert for peace;³⁵ this decision was no doubt taken with a view to providing an appropriate occasion for the expression of feelings while avoiding a possible repetition of the events that had taken place at the 1969 Honors Convocation. Nonetheless, the concert was briefly interrupted by representatives of the Black Students' Association, who took the opportunity to express some of their frustrations. Subsequently, Dr. Perry called a special meeting of the Executive Committee on June 3 to give its members an opportunity to hear the concerns and requests of members of the association. Acting as secretary *pro tempore* of the meeting, President Perry summarized their deeply felt needs, presented to the trustees in the rhetoric of the times as demands, as follows: "The need for intensifying the recruiting of black students to increase the number enrolled at Goucher; the need for increased financial aid for black students, especially the renewal of aid after the freshman year; increasing the number of Black Studies courses in the curriculum of the College; and intensifying the search for black administrative officials, faculty, and guidance personnel."³⁶

On June 15 the Executive Committee, clearly fearing a possible student attempt to take over a College building, discussed and supported a draft presented by President Perry of a "Code of Conduct for Safeguarding the Rights of Members of the Goucher College Community." On August 29 the full Board commended President Perry for his presentation of the code and approved the text, with a few modifications, aimed to discourage students and others from seizing College buildings or damaging its property.

The following year student agitation throughout the nation abated, and Goucher seemed much quieter. Dr. Perry commented to the Board of Trustees (on October 23, 1971) on the relative calm that appeared to have returned to American college campuses in the preceding year, in his opinion, "accompanied by a more healthy, optimistic and rational attitude." A year later, on September 18, 1972, he pointed out to the Executive Committee that the mood of the campus seemed more pleasant and relaxed than at any time in the previous three years. One symptom of the change in student attitudes was, as Dr. Perry remarked to the Board of Trustees on January 27, 1973, a notable increase in career-orientation among the students.³⁷

Nonetheless, the matter of parietal rules still concerned the students. On January 10, 1972, Dean Nichols reviewed for the benefit of the Executive Committee the report of the joint *ad hoc* Committee on Parietal Rules, and after extended discussion in which students participated, the Executive Committee voted to approve in principle the proposed recommendations:

Policy with respect to male visitation in dormitory rooms of the College will be decided by at least a two-thirds vote of members of each individual house or agreed upon subdivision of a house. Procedures and appropriate safeguards will be worked out by the Dean of Students Office in cooperation with student leaders and will be subject to approval of the President and Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees. Following approval, the policy will be implemented at the beginning of the 1972/73 academic year on an experimental basis, to be reviewed after two years of operation.³⁸

The student reaction was expressed by the jubilant front page banner headline of *Weekly's* issue of February 18, 1972: "24 Hour Parietals in Effect September 72"!

While the introduction in 1970 of a new institution, the College Assembly, apparently dealt acceptably with the students' concern that they have voice and vote in major legislative decisions, they continued to request representation on the Board of Trustees. On September 20, 1971, the Executive Committee discussed the merits of accepting an undergraduate or a first-year alumna as a member of the board. On January 8, 1973, the Executive Committee recommended to the board that it elect, as a matter of policy, beginning with the spring meeting of 1973, one eligible senior from a list of at least three proposed by the Students' Organization, the chosen individual to serve a three-year term without eligibility for reelection. The full board accepted the recommendation on January 27.³⁹

Conclusion

The role President Perry played in connection with student activism during his administration deserves more than token commendation. The responses of presidents on some other campuses and the events that ensued during this period suggest that the stance Dr. Perry and his staff adopted in the face of highly emotional and sometimes quickly considered and hastily expressed student demands was, on balance, the wisest and most salutary approach. When necessary, President Perry said no; he repeatedly declined to close the College; but regardless of the nature of his feelings, he always dealt politely with students and, even in difficult circumstances, he never seemed to lose his patience or his sense of humor.

While students directed much of their political energy during these troubled years toward national and international causes, their concern with improving their own college life expressed itself in a number of issues examined in this chapter and the next. When President Perry created the Committee on the Future of the College, he did not specifically intend to meet student revisionary demands, but the committee soon realized that it could not discuss the future of the institution in an historical vacuum; it had to take into account the reality of the contemporary scene. Accordingly, some of the College's ways of addressing student dissatisfaction were expressed in the historic "Report of the Committee on the Future of the College" (September 1969) and in ensuing legislation, though not all the recommendations of the committee responded to student concerns. The next chapter, which considers the report, continues the theme of student discontent, but it also reflects the institution's thinking on many matters (such as coeducation) which did not occupy a prominent place in the catalogue of student grievances in the early sixties.



*The Committee
on the Future
of the College*

According to the preface to the “Report of the Committee on the Future of the College,”¹ “At a meeting of the Goucher College Faculty on April 13, 1968, President Perry announced that he was establishing a committee to plan and conduct a comprehensive study of the College and to make recommendations for the years ahead. The committee was to be known as the Committee on the Future of the College, and it was to involve all elements of the college community—the governing boards, the faculty, the administration, the students, and the alumnae.”

Over the next several months, the committee was formed,² and when the roster was complete, it asked President Perry to serve as chairman. Dr. Perry accepted and appointed the director of development, Frederick Wehr, as executive secretary.

So began what would become one of the most influential committees in the history of Goucher College. Work began in earnest in September 1968 when the committee divided itself into three subcommittees to study, respectively, the academic program, the College's finances, and the College as a community. After four months' work, the three subcommittees presented a summary of their evaluations to the trustees, the faculty, the students, and the administrative staff.³

The next stage involved the preparation of recommendations for the future. With this task completed, the CFC⁴ presented its final report to the Faculty at two all-day retreats at Evergreen House on September 20 and 27, 1969.⁵

The introduction to the CFC report sets forth certain general suggestions for change that largely govern the specific recommendations incorporated in the body of the text:

The Committee suggests that the College's academic program should be more “student focused” and less “discipline focused.” This reorientation

recognizes the inherent capacities and interests of students and will be reflected in such areas as the curriculum, the study plans of individual students, and general academic policy.

We recommend that the College's programs give more recognition to the fact that, currently, only about a third of our students follow their Goucher experience with professional training at the graduate level. Thus, a liberal arts education at Goucher should be viewed more as a terminal experience insofar as formal education is concerned, and faculty and administrators involved in it should, accordingly, sharpen their concern for the achievement of the goals of this kind of education.

We recommend that the Goucher educational program give more emphasis to "opening up" the community in order that the student's experience may include more contact with aspects of the world outside. We particularly want to emphasize the desirability of involving this wider community as part of the student's intellectual experience. We also believe that Goucher should continue its efforts to increase the variety of backgrounds of its students in terms of their cultural, geographical, racial, and economic origins. In seeking further variety in the backgrounds and outlooks of its students, we believe that Goucher should encourage and welcome men students to enroll in courses at the College and to encourage our own women students to seek course work in exchange programs elsewhere.

The Committee views these proposed shifts of emphasis as changes in degree rather than in kind, and it reaffirms Goucher's traditional commitment to an undergraduate academic experience which combines high quality with flexibility and experimentation which encourages individual growth and self-discovery. Clearly, the College's programs must continue to be "discipline focused" to a certain degree, and opportunities for preparation for graduate study and professional training must continue to be offered. Thus, while much of the College's program will properly maintain its present focus, there is room without blurring that focus for experimentation and change in a number of areas.⁶

The faculty was not of one mind with regard to some of these proposals. The notion that the academic program should be more student-focused and less discipline-focused was at odds with the graduate training and the professional orientation of many faculty members. Graduate schools, except for providing an opportunity for their students to conduct a few undergraduate courses, characteristically devote little if any time to teaching their students how to teach. The primary concern of graduate schools is to produce scholars, researchers, future authors of learned articles and books, and scientists devoted to laboratory research and discovery. As a consequence of their training, Goucher's junior faculty with recent Ph.D.'s often tended to replicate themselves, training students to be future scholars in their own particular disciplines. While some more experienced faculty, who had devoted much of their careers to undergraduate teaching, were willing to consider the idea of a student-focused curriculum, faculty in certain areas, notably the sciences, had to cope with professional school requirements that left little room for compromise. Moreover, after years of preparing departmental majors for continued study at the graduate and professional school level, many senior faculty members had great difficulty in accepting the concept of the Goucher degree as a terminal point in formal education, with a concomitant need to change their teaching strategies. The last paragraph of the introduction was clearly intended to recognize, if not entirely to accommodate, these faculty concerns.

*The Rationale
for Changing the
Academic Program*

The extensive recommendations of the CFC involving changes in the academic program of the College encompassed such varied areas as the calendar, general requirements for the degree, the freshman year, the major, independent work, the honors program, and study abroad. The Faculty did not implement all the recommendations—at least not in the exact form presented—but it considered them all in great detail; witness the record-breaking number of faculty meetings held during the academic year 1969–70: twenty-three, several of them all-day Saturday sessions.

While the Faculty could consider some of the CFC's recommendations on their individual merits and accept or reject them without affecting the rest of the package, a basic rationale underlay the collection as a whole. One of the key objections to the existing curriculum was a very old one: rigidity or inflexibility. "These terms . . . covered many aspects of the program. Inflexibility was seen again and again in the various requirements, especially the distribution requirements; it was seen in certain kinds of uniformity characteristic of the Goucher program—all courses carrying the same weight, all students carrying the same course load, most getting through college at the same time."⁷ The CFC saw the entire academic process as course-bound, and courses as largely department-bound; furthermore, "no matter what the merits of the program, there was a feeling that students were not able to benefit fully from it or even understand it because of a poor advising structure that tended, by its operation, to make everything seem more rigid than it in fact was."⁸

A second CFC objection pointed to the existing curriculum's tendency to overemphasize the intellect: "The student is a person whose capacity for feeling and for socializing has also to be developed. . . . If the College does not actively support the student's search for identity, it is shirking its responsibility."⁹

While a few faculty members felt somewhat ambivalent about the question of inflexibility, seeing that characteristic as a necessary concomitant of intellectual rigor and professional discipline, a larger number found it difficult to imagine how an institution of higher education could possibly "overemphasize the intellect." For some in this group, supporting the students' "search for identity" was something that should have occurred at an earlier stage; it was not the proper role for scholars highly trained in academic disciplines. To those of this persuasion, the students' search might better be considered a prerequisite to a true apprenticeship in a serious intellectual endeavor.

A third CFC argument stressed the need for experimentation. By relaxing uniform requirements, increasing flexibility about what to teach and how to teach, and being open to new possibilities in interdisciplinary cooperation and off-campus work-study for credit, the College could help "the student who does not work comfortably in established routines to liberate herself intellectually by working out for herself in her own way the connections between the world she knows empirically and the world as organized and conceptualized by the academic mind, seeing finally the relevance of the one to the other."¹⁰

Another key idea in the committee's thinking had to do with the students' perception of the relevance of their studies.

It does not follow, we hope it is needless to say, that existing courses and departments must all be scrapped. Obviously, the ways in which organized knowledge is now presented in college do seem relevant to many students. But we believe the college might often make more of an effort to make the relevance clearer to students and that students for whom it is important to acquire intellectual discipline more independently . . . ought to be guaranteed the right to do so.¹¹

To bring about the needed changes, the CFC proposed as a first step the introduction of a new academic calendar.

The Calendar

When the College opened its doors in 1888, it operated on what is now called a 5-5 calendar, that is, one which divides the academic year into two semesters of approximately fourteen or fifteen weeks each, with students ordinarily taking five courses in each semester. In 1934, as we have seen, Goucher introduced a pioneering 3-3-3 calendar, which divided the year into three terms of ten weeks each, with students carrying three courses in each of the three terms. In 1969 the CFC proposed yet a third variation: a 4-1-4 calendar:

The . . . 4-1-4 system has generally been established in schools operating under a traditional calendar of two 15-week semesters with students carrying 5 courses per semester. These schools have seen the difficulties in the 5-5 system that Goucher saw in 1934 and, to meet some of these difficulties, devised the 4-1-4 system. The new calendar allowed for the completion of an entire semester of from 13-15 weeks by Christmas and a second semester, usually of the same length, beginning in February. Between the two semesters came a short January term of about 4 weeks. During each of the two semesters, students carried 4 courses each; during the January term they carried 1: hence the "4-1-4" designation.¹²

The relationship between the proposal that the College adopt a 4-1-4 calendar and the CFC's concern for overcoming rigidity is clear:

We recommend adoption of the . . . 4-1-4 calendar not primarily because it will enhance cooperation with Johns Hopkins and other colleges in the vicinity, but because the pressure of our present three-term calendar produces excessive standardization and, most importantly, because the one-course (and "course" may be too restrictive a term here) winter term in the 4-1-4 offers opportunities for much of the innovation and experimentation which we favor. If accepted, 4-1-4 would be a major change at Goucher, necessitating a restructuring of curricular offerings which would, in itself, probably stimulate some new approaches to academic endeavor.¹³

The three-term calendar, which the CFC hoped to supplant with the new system, had a disadvantage which became more and more noticeable with the passage of time: the feeling on the part of both students and faculty of having to work under heavy pressure. The compression of a course that might otherwise have spread over a standard semester into the space of ten weeks tended not to allow students enough time for digestion or steeping. Moreover, another reason impelled the CFC to recommend a move away from the 3-3-3 calendar:

The high degree of uniformity in the system—all students taking the same number of courses per term each term, each carrying the same credit and meeting always on Monday and Tuesday, Thursday and Friday—coupled with certain inflexibilities in curricular requirements and the absence of substantial variation in dormitory accommodations helps produce an impression of an overly standardized educational experience at Goucher.¹⁴

While this objection might in itself have justified the proposed change, the CFC suggested two other reasons. First, since every other institution in Baltimore operated on a semester system, unless Goucher followed suit there would be almost no possibility for Goucher students to profit from the interinstitutional program that allowed them to take courses on other campuses—nor, of course, could students from other colleges fit Goucher courses into *their* schedules. Second, and more important in the CFC's view, the January term provided flexibility and time for experimentation in the curriculum. The committee proposed that the January-term offerings, since they would not be traditional courses, should carry no credit but should appear on the student's record and be taken on a pass-fail basis. Every student would be required to complete successfully three January-term offerings, one of them in the freshman year.

The proposed calendar evoked intense soul-searching and debate when the Faculty began to discuss it on October 11, 1963. There was little disagreement about the advantage of ending the first semester before Christmas, thereby avoiding the traditional lame-duck period of two weeks or so that, in the traditional two-semester calendar, fell after the holidays and led directly into final examinations. Moreover, the advantage of a calendar that was in general conformity with that of other neighboring institutions could scarcely be denied. All the same, the 3-3-3 calendar still had strong adherents, including those who enjoyed what was widely perceived as a lighter teaching load, although the actual number of teaching hours per year was only slightly greater under the 4-1-4 proposal.

While the 3-3-3 calendar allowed a much later fall opening of the College, the 4-1-4 proposal produced an earlier end to the year, which benefited students seeking summer employment. All the same, a telling argument in favor of the 3-3-3 arrangement was made by small departments, who noted that they could offer a far richer curriculum under that system than the proposed one since a given faculty member could offer more courses in three terms than in two semesters.

While this argument was somewhat countered by the January-term proposal, that idea provoked particularly heated debate. Many faculty members found it difficult to imagine how they could conjure up, January after January, an interesting and worthwhile project that would meet the spirit of the CFC report without becoming a Mickey Mouse course of no real academic value. Basket weaving was frequently cited by opponents of the idea as a typical example of a January-term course, and there was much talk about lowering Goucher's standards and baby-sitting the students. Proponents of the January term insisted that with the exercise of sufficient imagination a satisfactory and even exciting array of courses could be offered, and that the January term would make possible a total concentration on one problem or topic that could not be accorded such treatment in a standard semester or trimester course.

When the debate finally concluded on November 1, 1969, the advocates of change had won the day, and the Faculty approved the third major calendar arrangement in Goucher history, withholding endorsement only of a few details concerning the January term, which were postponed for later consideration. As expected, the new calendar led to an upsurge of course elections by Goucher students at the Johns Hopkins University and an increase in exchange programs with other local institutions. Moreover, in January 1971 groups studied in London, Paris, Florence, Bermuda, and Mexico, while 750 students took courses on the Goucher campus.¹⁵

As the CFC's report surmised, the acceptance of the new calendar necessitated innovations in the curriculum beyond the specific recommendations of the committee. By October 1969 the faculty had introduced many curricular changes, including some forty new courses, even before it had seen the CFC report.¹⁶

The report included a number of recommendations concerning degree requirements, which the Faculty discussed and voted on in a series of meetings beginning on January 19, 1970. The first dealt with the distribution of courses within a student's program. At the time, all students were required to take four courses in Faculty III (the Natural Sciences and Mathematics) and two courses each in Faculties I (Languages, Literature, Philosophy, and the Arts) and II (History and the Social Sciences). While the CFC would, in the best of all possible worlds, have preferred a completely free elective system, it recognized the dangers involved: "Our belief in the value of freedom of choice is to a degree tempered by our realization that, when guidance is not perfect and students are not motivated or stimulated to look carefully at their first interest, bias and hasty judgment may lead to distorted choices and imbalances that are hard to justify. Therefore, we recommend a minimal set of requirements to guarantee a measure of breadth in student programs."¹⁷ Specifically, the committee recommended eliminating the distribution requirements in Faculties I and II and reducing the requirement in Faculty III to two courses. The rationale for retaining the Faculty III requirement was "the strong reluctance of many female students to take work in mathematics and the natural sciences."¹⁸

The Faculty, however, proved less sanguine than the CFC about students' willingness to take courses in all three faculties, nor did the Faculty fully accept the theory of women's strong reluctance to enroll in Faculty III courses; so, on January 27 it voted that all students be required to take a minimum of two courses in *each* of the three faculties.

The CFC favored reducing the foreign language requirement by eliminating the stipulation that all students (except those beginning a new language at Goucher) be required to take one course on Level 2 (that is, a literature course), but the Faculty found an eloquent speech by Professor Wolfgang E. Thormann, chairman of the Modern Languages Department, so persuasive that it voted not to change the requirement.¹⁹ Later, certain faculty members, claiming that they had been hypnotized by Professor Thormann's powerful rhetoric, attempted to reverse this decision, but they were out-voted.

Concerning the English composition requirement, on the other hand,

the Faculty accepted the CFC's recommendation in the following terms: "Proficiency in English is expected of all students. Students who have had serious difficulty or limited experience in English composition in secondary school shall be strongly urged by the dean in consultation with the English Department to take an expository writing course as soon as they enter College. Students who are reported by faculty members to the dean for weaknesses in composition shall be required, on recommendation of the English Department, to take a course in expository writing."²⁰

The requirement of a course in the Sacred Scriptures presented a special situation since it was incorporated in the College by-laws. The CFC recommended that:

the Board of Trustees amend the By-Laws of the College so as to eliminate the requirement of a course in the Sacred Scriptures which today seems anachronistic. We appreciate the moral and spiritual concern expressed in the College's original commitment to Christian education and would keep faith with that concern by having the College maintain strong departments in religion and philosophy and by encouraging students and faculty to undertake the study of questions about ultimate values and realities whenever they want to do so. The Department of Religion, we are sure, makes every effort to present the courses in the Sacred Scriptures not as religious indoctrination but as sound scholarship. Nevertheless, the requirement has something of an appearance of a religious test and stands out oddly at a time when the College has tried hard to shed every other vestige of the appearance of denominationalism or sectarianism. The requirement is not appropriate to the academic program, especially in light of our view that uniform requirements need to be reduced and students given more freedom of choice.²¹

The Faculty endorsed this recommendation on January 31, and on May 23 the Board of Trustees approved the Faculty's request to remove from the by-laws the requirement that "study of the Sacred Scriptures shall be part of the curriculum of every student who is graduated from said College."

The CFC had proposed requiring all students to take a total of three January-term offerings without credit, and it further recommended, even though the normal load of four courses per semester for eight semesters implied a requirement of thirty-two semester courses for the degree, that the requirement be reduced to twenty-nine semester courses. This reduction would include a normal load of three courses for the first semester of the freshman year with the rest of the reduction intended to allow students some free time to devote to extracurricular activities in semesters when such non-academic commitments promised to be heavy.

The Faculty decided, however, that the January-term offerings should, in fact, be treated as courses to minimize the risk of game playing and watered-down exercises unworthy of college credit. The Faculty therefore voted that only two January-term offerings should be required, with no more than three counting towards the degree. On that basis, it stipulated a minimum of thirty-two courses for the degree *including* the January-term offerings.²²

When the Faculty voted on February 7 that "seminars shall be available to all freshmen," it supported the CFC recommendation to continue the program of freshman seminars instituted by Dean Geen as one

means of fulfilling entering students' expectations that college would be not merely a continuation of high school but, in the words of the CFC report, "a truly different realm."

We saw in the preceding chapter what a burning issue the comprehensive examinations became in 1969. On January 31, 1970, in agreement with the general suggestions contained in the CFC report, the Faculty voted to eliminate comprehensive examinations as a degree requirement and substitute an integrative exercise: "Every candidate for the degree shall successfully complete in her senior year an exercise which demonstrates her ability to integrate the material of her major subject. Departments shall be responsible for providing within their curricula integrative exercises suitable to the nature of the major they offer."²³ A number of faculty members opposed this change, feeling that the comprehensive examination was the logical and even essential capstone to the major. Eliminating it would weaken the quality of the degree and cave in to student demands at the expense of sacrificing principles. A majority, however, felt that the integrative exercise was an adequate safeguard.

Finally, following the CFC's suggestion, the Faculty voted on February 7 that "students shall be allowed to undertake independent work at any time beginning with second semester of their freshman year."

As the foregoing account suggests, the Faculty was not prepared to accept *in toto* the CFC's recommendations concerning the curriculum. Still, while its stance was somewhat more conservative than the committee's, the Faculty introduced enough changes into the existing curriculum to meet at least some of the its strongest objectives. The shift in the academic calendar—though less unique to Goucher than the 1934 move to the 3-3-3 system—was nonetheless relatively drastic. If the Faculty declined to free the academic program as completely from required courses as the CFC had hoped, it did reduce the distribution requirement, eliminate certain specific course requirements as well as the controversial comprehensive examinations, and broaden the opportunities for students to do independent work. In short, although the new program was not as revolutionary as it might have been, it did help liberate the curriculum from excessive standardization and rigidity.

College Government

In March 1969 President Perry directed the Subcommittee on the College as a Community to "seek ways whereby Goucher College may develop an equitable and effective structure of community government which will provide for appropriate involvement of the entire College community at the various levels of policy-making and implementation." The basic assumption of the subcommittee,²⁴ to which the CFC as a whole subscribed, was that students should play a role in areas that concerned them directly, and to this end the CFC proposed certain changes in the College's committee structure. First, it suggested that the Committees on Faculty Affairs (Dismissals, Faculty Salaries, Nominations, Committee Loads, Publications and Research, and Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure) remain as faculty committees and continue to report to the Faculty. Concerning the second existing category of standing committees of the faculty, called Committees on Academic Affairs (Religious Activities, Public Lectures, Library, Admissions, Financial Aid, Rec-

ords, Independent Work and Honors, Curriculum, and the Discipline Appeals Board), the CFC proposed substantial changes in the direction of increased student participation with full voting power.

It remained to reconstitute the bodies to which these committees would report. The CFC suggested that the Faculty continue in its current form and that it concern itself with the affairs dealt with by the first category of committees mentioned above. Similarly, the President's Council would continue to play its existing role. The CFC then proposed creating two new bodies parallel to the Faculty and the President's Council respectively and named them the College Assembly and the Assembly Council. The College Assembly would consist of the "faculty of rank" plus approximately ten administrators and a number of undergraduates equal to one-third the number of combined faculty and administrative members, plus one graduate student. The Assembly Council, composed of the members of the President's Council plus seven members of the Executive Committee of the Students' Organization, would set the agenda for each Assembly meeting, as the President's Council did for each Faculty meeting.

This decision was not reached without very strenuous debate, first within the Subcommittee on the College as a Community and later in the Faculty. The student members of the subcommittee, reflecting the viewpoint of a substantial portion of the student body, adopted the position that had been advocated on many campuses in the sixties under the banner of student power. Students on the subcommittee initially insisted that the College Assembly should include *all* the students as members. They also supported student membership on all committees of the College, including the Faculty Salaries Committee and the Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure Committee. This position was based on the proposition that faculty members are responsible for providing their students with an education and that students, in their role of consumers, should by right have some control over their suppliers.

Within the faculty the more conservative members held that students were lacking in sufficient maturity and experience to judge the professional qualifications of their teachers, and that students, as apprentices, were not in a position to know what, specifically, was necessary for their education; nor were students capable of evaluating their own performance, which could only be measured by experienced professionals. If students were to be given such powers, some faculty members argued, they would in effect be granting their own degrees. Moreover, to give students a majority vote in the Assembly would be to grant primary academic power to a group which could, without commensurate responsibilities or accountability, legislate long-term policies whose outcome, given the students' brief sojourn within the institution, they might never experience in person.

Despite these objections, a majority of faculty members were willing to grant the students a stronger voice and a minority vote on matters involving the academic program, though not in those of direct concern only to the faculty, such as reappointment, promotion, tenure, dismissals, salaries, publication, and research. After prolonged and sometimes heated discussion, the compromise position proposed by the CFC prevailed, and on November 8, 1969, the Faculty approved a resolution defining the College Assembly and the composition of committees un-



Class in College Center courtyard, 1960s

der the new organization of the College community and formally requested the Board of Trustees to create the assembly and implement the other necessary changes to bring the whole system into being. On May 23, 1970, the Board of Trustees approved in principle the creation of the College Assembly, empowering the president to draft procedures and regulations and to implement the new form of governance when the new procedures, regulations, and the necessary by-laws had been approved and adopted by the Board. The first meeting of the Assembly convened on October 14.

Coeducation

The fact that the CFC even raised the question of Goucher's becoming a coeducational institution was a consequence of the circumstances in which the College found itself in 1969. The effects of falling enrollments combined with soaring inflation, which brought the College to the edge of financial disaster during the years of the Perry administration, is the subject of chapter 15. Suffice it to say here that the Consumer Price Index rose from less than 1 percent in 1961 to 6 percent in 1969, and this increase, combined with a drop in the College's enrollment, produced a \$77,000 deficit for 1968–69. While no one could yet anticipate that this was the first of a series of five successive deficits totaling \$1,258,000 by the end of 1972–73, it was not too early for a sense of real insecurity to be felt about the future of the institution, especially if enrollments continued to drop. Coeducation was viewed as one possible approach to increasing enrollment; increased cooperation—or even merger—with the Johns Hopkins University was another.

In discussing coeducation, the CFC report observed that of all the questions it had considered, none was more highly charged nor less susceptible to measured analysis of outcomes than this. After a detailed

consideration of both sides of the issue, the CFC suggested putting further effort into improving the cooperative arrangements with the Johns Hopkins University and recommended that:

the College consider the possibility of setting up consortium arrangements with other men's, women's, and coeducational colleges. . . .

Given the uncertainties of our day, we suggest that, in a reasonable period of time—certainly, within five years—a formal assessment again be made of the development of our relations with other institutions, of our admissions situation, and of the educational needs of the College. If such an assessment indicates the need for new policies and actions, the question of coeducation should again be considered.²⁵

By the fall of 1971, the accumulated deficit had reached \$659,000, with a \$364,000 deficit in 1970–71 largely caused by an unusually large number of students who had withdrawn over the summer. While many faculty members and students were opposed in principle to Goucher's relinquishing its historic role as a college for women, the bleakness of the financial outlook brought about a major change in the attitude of at least some faculty members who began to fear that unless Goucher broadened its potential pool of applicants by becoming coeducational, the College might have no future at all. Accordingly, the College Assembly, at its meeting on November 17, voted 56 to 33 to request the president to ask the Board of Trustees to begin the study of factors bearing on coeducation, as recommended in the CFC's report, at the earliest feasible time, anticipating by three years the CFC's suggested outer limit of five years for such reconsideration.

On January 27, 1973, President Perry discussed with the board in considerable detail the question of coeducation. All constituent bodies of the College, as well as outside institutions with experience in this matter, received questionnaires to complete and return. Dr. Perry concluded that "we have little clear-cut evidence, either educational or financial, on which to base an easy decision."²⁶

A complicating element was added when on April 2, 1973, the trustee Executive Committee accepted with deep regret Dr. Perry's resignation (effective June 30, 1973) in order to accept the presidency of Agnes Scott College in Atlanta, Georgia. The impending vacancy inevitably affected the process of reaching decisions on such matters as coeducation and the College's relationship with the Johns Hopkins University.

A further complication developed when it became clear that the Board of Trustees had in mind a solution to the College's financial dilemma different from that of the Faculty. While the Faculty Committee on Coeducation had recommended unanimously on March 27 that Goucher become coeducational, the trustee Planning and Priorities Committee voted to recommend to the Executive Committee that the board conduct as soon as possible a study of future relations between Goucher College and the Johns Hopkins University, and that until completion of that study, no recommendation be made on the matter of coeducation.

Nonetheless, after prolonged discussion (reflecting the fact that faculty members were deeply divided on this issue), the Faculty voted 37 to 20 on April 25 to accept the report of its Committee on Coeducation and to submit it to the Executive Committee, along with a recommenda-

tion that a decision in favor of coeducation be made by the beginning of the next academic year. The Faculty's feeling of urgency arose from concern about the effect further delay could have on the admissions office's efforts to retool, if necessary, for coeducation, as well as the problems posed by the search for a new president.

Despite the Faculty's sense of the need for haste, the board held to its position that explorations concerning closer cooperation with the Johns Hopkins University should take priority over the question of coeducation.

Continuing negotiations with Johns Hopkins made it clear that merger with the university was not the best solution to Goucher's problems. From the university's point of view, Goucher had a very valuable asset in the form of its campus. Caught in the center of the city, Johns Hopkins was very short of land on which to undertake new construction, and the Goucher campus represented a tempting tract of real estate. On the other hand, Goucher came complete, not only with acreage, but with a faculty. Given the university's status as a research institution, the idea of the Goucher faculty's taking over responsibility for teaching undergraduates, while freeing the university faculty to devote itself fully to research and the training of graduate students, no doubt seemed worthy of initial consideration, but problems emerged when that arrangement was examined more closely. First, the university faculty did not embrace the notion of Goucher faculty teaching upper-division undergraduate courses which often doubled as graduate courses; second, if Goucher faculty taught all the undergraduates, there would be no way to employ the graduate students as teaching assistants, an occupation considered necessary both to the graduate students' training and to financing their education. Other matters such as tenure and the size of the Goucher faculty made merger, even taking into account the real estate involved, a less attractive step than was first apparent. Accordingly, the focus of discussion shifted to greater cooperation between the two institutions, which would not in itself solve the problems of increasing costs and reduced tuition revenue that were depleting Goucher's expendable endowment. For these reasons, the Executive Committee voted unanimously on September 17, 1973:

1. To favor increased cooperation with the Johns Hopkins University, rather than merger
2. To move ahead, discuss, and decide the matter of coeducation at Goucher
3. To proceed with the search for a president of Goucher College
4. To implement a program for a five-year plan to reduce the budget in order to avoid running out of expendable endowment funds
5. To form a committee responsible for the full-scale utilization of Goucher College's facilities²⁷

The College implemented these resolutions, some during the acting presidency of Dr. Rhoda Dorsey, others after her election as eighth president.

On September 20 the College Assembly, after considerable discussion, went on record (by a vote of 59 to 7, with 2 abstentions) in favor of further discussion of cooperation with the Johns Hopkins University.

The faculty, the administrative staff, and the students also favored cooperation rather than merger. On October 8 the Assembly, with strong student support and a shift in some faculty votes, defeated a motion in favor of coeducation by a vote of 61 to 36, with 4 abstentions; on the same day, the trustee Priorities and Planning Committee voted 11 to 1 to recommend that Goucher maintain its status as a liberal arts college for women and approved unanimously a recommendation that the College develop a means of achieving an educationally distinctive program. On October 13 the Board of Trustees voted (with three nays) to accept the recommendations of the Priorities and Planning Committee. Thus, the question of Goucher's becoming coeducational was put temporarily to rest.



*Major Financial
Problems: Reality
versus Mirage*

To understand and interpret the financial problems that arose during the Perry administration and the years immediately following, it may be helpful to recall the general economic circumstances that prevailed nationally at that time, particularly as these conditions affected higher education in the United States.

*The Financial State
of Higher Education
in America
(1967–1973)*

A major study of the state of higher education during the late sixties and early seventies, *Priorities for Action: Final Report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education*, contains a revealing subsection, “The Financial Depression,” that makes the following observation:

Institutions of higher education escaped their genteel poverty after World War II; they even became newly prosperous. But a “new depression” has quickly followed the new-found prosperity, and it is likely to be more enduring—higher education has moved from genteel poverty to genteel poverty in one generation. It is undoubtedly better to have prospered and lost than never to have prospered at all, but the adjustment to the new depression is more difficult than was the adjustment to the new prosperity.¹

Two years earlier the Carnegie Commission had published another volume, this one by Earl F. Cheit, with the title indirectly quoted above: *The New Depression in Higher Education*. In his foreword the then chairman of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Clark Kerr, first called attention to the post-*Sputnik* era and the enormous increase in federal and state aid to higher education which enabled colleges and universities to absorb the postwar baby-boom. Dr. Kerr then turned to the abrupt reversal, ca. 1967, when institutional income began to lag behind expenditures. The body of the book studies this financial reversal in terms of conditions then existing at forty-one col-

leges and universities. After analyzing these data, Professor Cheit concluded that twenty-nine (or 71 percent) of the institutions studied "were either headed for financial trouble or were already in financial difficulty" (p. viii). Dr. Cheit interpreted these figures to mean that the colleges and universities "headed for financial trouble represented, on a weighted basis, 42 percent of the institutions and 54 percent of the students in the nation, . . . excluding the specialized institutions. This suggests that just about 1,000 institutions, enrolling nearly four million students, were headed for financial trouble."²

According to Dr. Kerr, private institutions were considerably more likely than public ones to face financial difficulty in the spring of 1970; within the private sector the liberal arts colleges were, after the universities, most prone to financial woes. Coupled with an acceleration of the decline in enrollment over several years, this implied that "the survival of many of our private institutions of higher education [is] in jeopardy."³ Professor Cheit noted that this situation had not escaped the attention of the national press: "nearly every popular journal has by now [1971] recognized that higher education is in a financial depression and has published its 'financial-crisis-on-the-campus' article."⁴

What caused this fiscal plight? Though the steady rise in costs since World War II had long been felt, a new financial development, a relative or even absolute decline in income, emerged in the late sixties. Such a rise in costs accompanied by a decline in income had not occurred since the Great Depression.⁵ Professor Cheit notes that, after ten years of building and expanding, the trend on campuses in 1971 had reversed direction. "The talk, the planning, and the decisions then centered on reallocating, on adding only by substitution, on cutting, trimming, even struggling to hang on."⁶

The peculiar nature of the income squeeze differentiated the new depression from that of the thirties. Although all prices (except stock market share prices, whose increase might have helped the endowment) were rising at an unforeseeable rate, income continued dropping. Some Goucher faculty salaries actually increased in value during the Great Depression because the drop in prices outweighed the faculty's four-year, 10 percent salary cut and the continuing salary freeze. During the period beginning in 1968 salaries soon fell well behind the inflationary increases in prices, impelling President Perry and the Board of Trustees to increase faculty and administrative salaries even when the income vs. expenditure ratio dictated, from the College's point of view, a freeze or even a cut. Meanwhile, the costs of building and operations found colleges like Goucher unprepared. A nationwide dilemma, this financial crisis involving soaring costs and falling enrollments had special implications for higher education. With their declining incomes, colleges and universities suffered both from inflation and from policies used to combat inflation.⁷ The decision by the federal government to help curb the inflationary spiral by spending less money resulted in a decline in the growth of support for higher education—which required even more support precisely because of inflation. Private donors and foundations found themselves solicited for funds on behalf of important causes other than education; as benefactors responded to these requests, academic institutions invariably suffered a corresponding decline in gifts.

The student revolt also took its toll. Dr. Cheit notes the impossibility

of measuring precisely the impact of campus disturbances on institutional income, but he estimates the effect as substantial. Campus unrest produced adverse reactions among both private donors and state legislatures, and this negative response touched even campuses which had not experienced disturbances. Furthermore, stock market trends did not favor academic institutions since stock prices, unlike prices in general, were falling, thereby reducing the tax incentive for potential private donors of major contributions. Dr. Cheit observes that "people who are losing money in the stock market are not eager to give large gifts to their alma mater."⁸ In short, for colleges in general and for Goucher in particular, the fundamental problem was rooted in two uncontrollable factors: rampant inflation and falling enrollments.⁹

*The Goucher Scene:
The Threat of
Financial Disaster*

While many readers are doubtless aware that Goucher found itself in a grave financial position by the end of the Perry years, fewer probably understand the precise circumstances that brought the College to the point of declaring a state of financial exigency.

Needless to say, any institution's financial objective is to spend no more than it receives, ideally ending each fiscal year with a surplus. While a college operates on a nonprofit basis, surpluses added to the endowment provide a hedge against years in which a balanced budget cannot be achieved. An institution can tolerate an occasional deficit if, over several years, an equivalent amount in surpluses wipes out the red ink; real trouble looms when an uninterrupted series of deficits forces the Board of Trustees to use expendable endowment funds to meet expenses. Goucher shared this necessity with many institutions. According to a 1971 study by the Association of American Universities, one quarter of all private colleges and universities were, by that date, drawing on endowment to meet operating expenses.¹⁰ Since a college cannot make legal use of most endowment funds for current operations, only a limited amount of expendable endowment is available. If a long series of deficits leads to the exhaustion of expendable funds, an institution, regardless of the size of its total endowment, can no longer pay its bills and—failing a sudden windfall—must close its doors. While this description of a complicated process has been deliberately simplified, it makes an important point: by 1973 Goucher faced the prospect of exhausting its expendable endowment in a very short period, a situation which forced the trustees to mandate drastic action.

During the new depression, as Dr. Cheit pointed out, sharp inflation combined with a drop in enrollments led to income lagging behind costs in most private institutions; one quarter of them had to draw on expendable endowment to meet operating expenses. That Goucher fell into this group is clear from table 7, which shows the projected and actual deficits incurred from 1968 to 1973.

These discouraging figures inevitably raise the question of whether or not the College did everything possible to alleviate the situation. To respond, we must first examine the sources of Goucher's income and the nature of its expenditures. Only by achieving an equilibrium between the two could the College have avoided the accumulated deficit of \$1.26 million.

Table 7 Goucher College Projected and Actual Deficits, 1968-73

Fiscal Year	Projected Deficit	Actual Deficit
1968-69	(\$ 75,000)	(\$ 77,000)
1969-70	(51,000)	(218,000)
1970-71	(40,000)	(364,000)
1971-72	(260,000)	(149,000)
1972-73	(143,000)	(450,000)
Total Actual Deficit		(1,258,000)

Source: Office of the Vice-President for Financial Affairs.

Goucher's sources of income fall into two categories:¹¹

1. Income the College can expect annually and estimate a year in advance, barring sudden shifts in the prevailing circumstances, including:
 - a. Tuition income, which can be predicted accurately provided there is no major unexpected change in the enrollment pattern
 - b. Annual giving, such as the Alumnae Fund and corporate support
 - c. Return on the endowment, assuming a relatively steady market
2. Exceptional sources of income, including such nonannual, one-time events as:
 - a. Unexpected major gifts, grants, or bequests that increase annual income significantly, but only once
 - b. The sale of unneeded property, which, of course, can be sold only once
 - c. Capital campaigns and other special fund-raising efforts independent of annual giving—the only one of these three items not normally restricted as to use

Goucher's expenses fall into two similar categories:

1. Regular ongoing expenses, such as:
 - a. Salaries, wages, and benefits for faculty, staff, and hourly workers
 - b. Administrative expenses, including funding of such offices as Public Relations, Admissions, Development, and Student Life
 - c. Academic program expenses (other than salaries)
 - d. Financial aid for students
 - e. Energy costs (coal, oil, electricity)
2. Exceptional expenses, which may be capital in nature (like the first two of the following examples) or ongoing (like the last two):
 - a. Cost of constructing new buildings
 - b. Payment of debts incurred by borrowing (to cover construction costs or current expenses)
 - c. Sudden increases in energy costs
 - d. Sudden increases in wages, such as those caused by the unionization of hourly workers

Balancing the budget begins with creating a budget, an undertaking that presupposes the administration's ability to predict with reasonable accuracy the revenue and expenditures the College will encounter the following fiscal year. Some of the categories of exceptional income and



Brownlee Sands Corrin lecturing in Merrick Lecture Hall, 1970s

outflow listed above are often not foreseeable, but Goucher's budgets were normally kept sufficiently flexible to take account of all but the most extreme deviations from the norm. Only unanticipated heavy expenditures cause a problem. During most of the Perry years, however, the process of anticipating even regular, annual income and standard expenditures seems to have eluded the grasp of the College's financial prophets.¹² A glance at table 7 suggests that unless both the Board of Trustees and the administration took total leave of their senses during the last four reported years (when their deficit projections were wildly at variance with the actual outcomes), the prevailing economic situation must have fluctuated so violently that a reasonable estimate of even normal, ongoing revenue and costs was impossible.

Dr. Cheit's analysis provides some clues as to why this situation existed, at Goucher and throughout American higher education. But while Goucher shared many problems with other institutions, it also had to contend with its own adversities. To analyze and evaluate the College's attempts at budget management in this period, we must consider the array of economic circumstances that affected Goucher in these years.

By 1969 the need for increased financial resources for operating expenses caused President Perry to appoint a new trustee Development Committee to assist him in all areas of financial planning for the immediate future.¹³ By this time the necessity for planning was as obvious as the difficulties involved. The first two Perry administration deficits were already history, so the problem had become how to avoid another. To increase income and to decrease expenses were the goals. Since tuition,

the principal source of annual income, depends on the successful recruitment of new students combined with a high retention rate of current students, the decision to increase tuition while simultaneously attempting to increase the size of the student body provided a logical first step in the effort to improve Goucher's financial outlook.

Raising tuition and fees is a relatively simple operation, and the board took this step almost every year during this period. The College increased tuition for 1969–70 from \$1,600 to \$1,800 and raised fees for room and board from \$1,350 to \$1,400, though this action alone would not prevent a deficit. The board increased tuition and fees by another \$300 for 1970–71,¹⁴ and repeated the process (with minor variations in the amount of increase) in 1973–74.¹⁵

*Tuition and
Enrollment*

While raising tuition and fees proved comparatively easy, increasing enrollments did not. Reporting to the Board of Trustees on October 28, 1967, Dr. Perry noted that although the current student body stood at 1,037, the College had experienced a small but steady decline in the number of applicants for admission over the preceding two years. "In a time of increased competition from less expensive state-supported institutions," he said, "the College will have to plan and work vigorously to attract students of high calibre."¹⁶ Goucher's plan for solvency included recruiting students attracted by the new calendar and curriculum, a more flexible program, and new living arrangements; yet this operation, even if successful, would help the financial situation only if current freshmen, sophomores, and juniors returned to the College the following year. In 1970–71 such was not the case. While the original budget for that year had assumed full residence halls, an unprecedented number of withdrawals during the summer resulted in a smaller student body and fewer residents. Consequently, the College fell short of income projections by approximately \$115,000.¹⁷

A similar situation occurred in 1972–73, when the opening enrollment showed a decrease of thirty-seven from the previous year. Contributing factors included the large graduating class of 1972, the necessity of reducing the graduate program to save costs, the continuing large number of withdrawals of upperclass students transferring to other institutions, and the effects of students graduating in less than four years—a process encouraged by the CFC report.

By January 1973 enrollments were dropping even at public institutions in twenty-one states; only two-year community colleges were increasing in size and number. Goucher's 1972–73 undergraduate enrollment had declined to 979 full-time equivalents from 1,029 in 1971–72. Admissions applications appeared to be 25 percent behind 1971–72 as of the same date. Because of falling enrollments, a significant 1972–73 deficit seemed unavoidable. While the budgeted deficit was \$142,792.50, the College had spent 45 percent of its total budget by December 31. Enrollments were 2 percent less than budgeted, the fall dormitory occupancy 5.4 percent lower (down from 821 to 777), and the January-term enrollment 9.1 percent below expectation; accordingly, actual income might predictably fall \$100,000 below the amount budgeted, and the true deficit might be twice the anticipated figure.¹⁸

Goucher's enrollment decline reflected both national and local

trends. Apart from the national drop in the population of college-age students, the effect of the new depression influenced parents' ability to pay the fees of private institutions. In addition, perhaps caused by the desire of many undergraduates to experience more varieties of education than one institution could supply, an unprecedented increase in student mobility developed across the country. In a relatively small women's college this tended to lead to more student withdrawals than entering transfers could replace. Attrition figures increased as Goucher continued to graduate senior classes larger than entering freshman classes and as students took advantage of the enhanced opportunities to complete their degree requirements in less than the usual time.

*Salaries, Wages,
and Benefits*

Given the apparently intractable nature of the enrollment decline, the College's next option in its attempt to control the budget deficits was to reduce its principal category of annual expenditures: the salaries, wages, and benefits it provided its employees. In the language of economists, the academic enterprise is labor intensive. The principal cost of operating a college is the money spent on personnel. An institution can freeze or even diminish salaries and wages, as Goucher did during the Great Depression, or it can reduce the size of its work force; but unlike the business world, a college must reckon with the fact that many of its most expensive employees, the senior faculty, have tenured positions that can be eliminated only in very exceptional circumstances.

At the beginning of the Perry administration, the president and the trustees showed more concern for the negative effects of inflation on the faculty's cost of living than for the negative impact of salaries on the budget. Thus, despite the treasurer's estimate that the deficit for 1968–69 would be \$50,000, President Perry announced that the College planned to raise staff salaries and wages. Meetings with the Faculty Salaries Committee and the Board of Trustees, he explained, had resulted in the establishment of procedures to adjust faculty salaries in times of inflation within the limits of Goucher's financial resources; thus Faculty increases for the following year would probably average 6 to 7 percent.¹⁹ A few months later, several changes enhanced the faculty's (though not the College's) financial circumstances: increased travel allowances to professional meetings, total disability insurance, and improved faculty salaries, which placed Goucher among the top 125 colleges in terms of average and minimum faculty earnings.²⁰ Unfortunately, these benefits came at a price. According to the Budget Committee report, the operating budget for 1969–70 was \$4,430,886, an increase of 8 percent over the preceding year. Included was an expected deficit of \$51,000, attributed to declining enrollments and increases of approximately 7 percent in salaries and wages. Provision for a pension plan for hourly and clerical workers placed further demands on the College's resources.

Reluctance to balance the budget at the expense of personnel became even more apparent a year later when, on the recommendation of the Faculty Salaries Committee, the Executive Committee approved an extremely generous program of faculty salary raises, which would add approximately \$135,000, or nearly 12 percent, to the budget for full-



Students picnicking on campus, mid-1970s

time faculty compensation. The increases would benefit primarily associate and assistant professors.²¹ The minutes of the Executive Committee for December 7, 1970, record, however, that "because of the present financial situation, [President Perry] had advised the faculty that they could not look forward to increases in salary in the year ahead, and that tight budgetary controls would be necessary."²²

The outlook brightened a little in March 1971 when the College received grants of \$50,000 from the Perot Foundation and \$200,000 from the Andrew Mellon Foundation, the latter to be spent specifically for faculty salaries in not more than three years. The Executive Committee congratulated Dr. Perry for obtaining these grants and approved his recommendation that the Mellon grant be used to increase faculty salaries by 5 percent and that funds from other sources be used to provide like increases for administrative and clerical personnel.²³

Despite the Mellon grant, the deficit mandated a reduction in expenditures for faculty salaries. The very high proportion of tenured faculty at senior (hence expensive) ranks posed one obstacle to such a reduction. While tenure was preserved, promotions underwent more careful scrutiny, with promotions to the rank of associate professor terminal in certain cases.

Since maintaining the 1:12 faculty-student ratio within the framework of the enrollment decline implied reducing the faculty by six or seven full-time equivalents, a Priorities and Planning subcommittee was appointed to study ways of achieving faculty reductions.²⁴



All College Barbeque, Freshman Week, late 1970s

While faculty salaries constituted the largest share of the College's salary and wage package, any significant increase in the wages of hourly workers would naturally have a deleterious effect on the effort to balance the budget. Thus, the College's financial outlook was not improved when, in an election held at the College, the hourly wage earners chose to be represented by the Amalgamated Municipal Employees Laborers International Union, AFL-CIO, Local 1231.²⁵ On January 16, 1971, Vice President Casey informed the Board of Trustees that the unionization of hourly wage employees would add approximately \$41,000 to the 1970-71 budget, with further increases of about \$50,000 in each of the following two years. By May 1971 the unionization of the hourly workers and the College's food contractor had added about \$180,000 in annual expenses.

Goucher, in short, found itself in a very awkward posture. Falling enrollments, the hourly workers' unionization, and the inexperience of

wholesale cuts in the faculty forced the College to consider other items on the list of income sources and expenses that it could try, respectively, to enhance or decrease. On the expense side of the ledger, the only realistic possibility was to trim administrative and academic costs (apart from salaries) to the greatest degree possible.

*Major Financial
Problems*

The College could not afford to reduce one administrative-academic expense: financial aid to students. This would only exacerbate the enrollment decline. Part of the College's deficit in 1969–70 reflected an increase of \$38,000 in the scholarship budget.²⁶ Other contributors to the 1969–70 deficit included additional personnel and increased promotional efforts in the Admissions Office and more intensive promotional work for the Alumnae Fund.²⁷ These expenditures, which illustrate the melancholy fact that one must often spend money to increase income, were clearly intended to enhance enrollment and annual giving. But by 1971 the gravity of the situation required budget tightening in all departments and offices. Indeed, some steps taken because of the accumulating deficits were almost pathetically stringent. For example, according to the minutes of the Executive Committee meeting of November 8 President Perry stated that in the interests of economy there would be no gifts that year from the College to board members; he planned to write a Christmas letter instead, a plan which met with the unanimous approval of the committee.²⁸

*Administrative
and Academic
Program Costs*

Far more significant and extensive cuts appeared elsewhere in the area of administrative costs. On January 27, 1973, President Perry commented to the Board of Trustees on the heroic effort of offices and departments to hold down expenditures; annual expenses over the past five years had risen only from 5 to 10 percent, and the previous year's



Students in Nuts & Bolts minicourse, January 1971

expenses had risen only 3 percent. Dr. Perry also announced, in accordance with financial Vice President Robert H. Barnett's recommendation to the Executive Committee,²⁹ the closing, beginning the following academic year, of the Mary Fisher and Froelicher dining rooms, to be used for other purposes not yet determined. Mr. Barnett had suggested that this action would produce a saving of \$50,000 to \$75,000 a year.

Ironically, all these frustrating attempts to manage the budget under highly adverse conditions were further impeded by actions taken prior to the onset of the budget crisis itself: the construction of expensive buildings.

When Stimson Hall was built, the Board of Trustees and the administration assumed that for the indefinite future the College could count on a highly qualified student body of approximately 1,000. Accordingly, they built Stimson Hall to bring the housing facilities on campus to the appropriate capacity.³⁰ The construction of Stimson Hall created an outstanding debt of \$637,000 inherited by President Perry—a debt that rose by 1971 to \$735,000 as a result of high interest rates. To liquidate this encumbrance before it reached totally unmanageable proportions, the trustees found themselves forced to sell securities and divert bequests, gifts, and grants that would otherwise have helped to increase the endowment.

In addition to coping with the considerable debt left over from past construction, the board also found itself faced with the need to build the new wing of the Julia Rogers Library. The lowest bid for the addition exceeded the budget allotment by \$160,000, and the Executive Committee asked Vice President Casey to explore with the architects and the builder possible changes in design to bring about savings. On October 23 Dr. Perry informed the Executive Committee that Messrs. Moore and Hutchins planned to shave \$100,000 to \$150,000 from the cost of the library addition by simplifying heating and plumbing and eliminating air conditioning systems. With this accomplished, the College would accept new bids on the project. In due course the Executive Committee awarded a contract for the new library wing at a total cost of \$845,685.³¹

The library addition was necessary despite the reduction in the size of the student body, since the critical mass of a college library of any respectability depends on factors other than the precise number of undergraduates. Nonetheless, the debt on old construction and the ongoing cost of the new library wing had a devastating effect on budget management when combined with the effects of the new depression. The impact of continued borrowing received extensive and serious discussion at the Board of Trustees meeting on October 31, 1970; Mr. Eney raised again the question of continued borrowing in the November 9 meeting of the Executive Committee and suggested that unrestricted bequests the trustees had placed voluntarily (not at the donor's request) in the expendable endowment be used to cover the plant deficit arising from the construction of Stimson Hall. Mr. Eney also reminded the committee of the need to build up the expendable endowment, though his previous recommendation would have, temporarily, the opposite

effect. Indeed, increasing the expendable endowment was virtually impossible under the prevailing circumstances. On January 4, 1971, for example, Vice President Casey recommended to the Executive Committee that it apply a \$476,000 Ford Foundation grant and a \$160,000 Conner bequest to the plant deficit, which had now reached \$735,000.³²

One chance of offsetting the construction debt lay in the sale of unwanted land, particularly the twenty-six-acre parcel on Fairmount Avenue. Rekindled a number of times in the sixties and seventies, this hope seemed always destined for extinction by decisions of the zoning board or the courts. For example, at the Board of Trustees meeting on January 18, 1969, Mr. Eney advised against any expectation of immediate additional revenue from land sales. He reported that the Court of Appeals had ruled against the College in a zoning case, thereby voiding the sale of the twenty-six-acre tract on Fairmount Avenue to Sears Roebuck and Hochschild Kohn. On May 24 Mr. Eney concluded a meeting of the Board of Trustees with one of the tersest reports in Goucher history: the Land Development Committee, he said, had "met, talked, and decided nothing."³³ Not until October 23, 1971, could Mr. Eney say anything positive about land sales; even then, though encouraging, the news was hardly thrilling: he announced the sale of the Amoco service station property on Dulaney Valley Road for \$160,000. Not until 1982 did the College finally sell the Fairmount Avenue tract for \$3,000,000.³⁴

*The Hope
of Selling Land*

Unable to balance its budgets through purely internal efforts, the College had to seek outside assistance. As early as February 19, 1968, the trustee Executive Committee authorized a special subcommittee to study the possibility of a fund-raising campaign to help eradicate the plant deficit. The prospects were not too favorable. President Perry scotched any hope that the College's income problem might be mitigated by significant gifts or grants (in the absence of a campaign) when he reported to the Board of Trustees on January 18, 1969, that Goucher had received no large financial grants during the preceding year. Even so, a generous gift from an alumna had covered the expenses involved in the work of the Committee on the Future of the College, and two other gifts from members of the board had enabled the College to begin the development of courses in the sciences for nonscience majors.

*Bequests, Gifts,
Grants, and
a Campaign*

Despite Dr. Perry's discouraging comments, the trustees resolved, on October 25 to "recognize the critical need for additional funds for the support of the College and authorize the Development Committee to proceed with planning a major capital funds campaign."³⁵

On January 17, 1970, Mr. Edgar Gemwell, whom the College had engaged for pre-campaign work, expressed the view that the campaign should begin in the fall of 1971 and continue for thirty weeks. On June 12, 1971, Mr. Donald H. Wilson, Jr., the campaign chairman, proposed to the board that the campaign run through June 30, 1973, with the Baltimore phase extending from September 1971 through June 1972 and the national phase running from September 1972 through June 1973.

At the same meeting of the board, Vice President Casey projected the following budget figures for the years 1971-72 and 1975-76:

	1971-72	1975-76
Income	\$5,043,000	\$5,133,000
Expenses	5,187,000	6,190,000
Deficit	144,000	1,057,000

Mr. Casey listed increased tuition, room and board fees, and alumnae giving as possible ways to reduce the 1975-76 deficit by \$698,000. Even with these steps, the College would still need additional income of \$359,000, or approximately \$9 million in new endowment. The Board of Trustees then unanimously passed a motion that Goucher commit itself to a \$10,000,000 capital funds campaign, and in its issue of September 24, 1971, *Weekly* announced the start of a campaign called the Program for Human Resources.

At the Faculty meeting of October 20 Vice President Casey cited a recent study indicating that more than one hundred American private colleges had exhausted their liquid assets and were on the brink of disaster. Moreover, the situation was growing worse: deficits far greater than expected were increasing. If present trends continued, 254 colleges surveyed would be eligible for bankruptcy in ten years.³⁶ Goucher College, Mr. Casey reminded the faculty, had suffered deficits of \$77,000 in 1968-69, \$218,000 in 1969-70, and \$364,000 in 1970-71. The trustees had covered these deficits by using expendable endowment funds. Without the current campaign, Mr. Casey suggested, the annual deficit for 1975-76 would probably approach \$327,000. With a successful campaign, the College should just break even in 1975-76.

Commenting on Mr. Casey's remarks, President Perry called attention to the Board of Trustees' willingness to begin the campaign without first balancing the budget, but only with the understanding that the deficit must be gradually eliminated. He further observed that all projections included steady increases in faculty salaries with no catastrophic cuts in the academic program.³⁷

Because of careful preparation, the campaign by September 22, 1971, had raised \$2,000,000, mostly in pledges. By November 1971 it had raised \$2.5 million, and the State of Maryland had granted the College \$113,000; on January 15, 1972, the campaign had passed \$3,000,000 in pledges and bequests.³⁸ Meanwhile, the Alumnae Fund had continued to break its own record, the 1971-72 total reaching \$298,000—well over the goal of \$275,000. Gifts and grants in 1971-72 amounted to more than \$2,000,000, one of the largest annual totals ever. The market value of the endowment on June 30, 1972, exceeded \$15,000,000, compared with \$11,000,000 five years earlier. Campaign pledges and bequests approximated \$4,000,000, with over \$2,000,000 already in hand. On January 27, 1973, Mr. Wilson reported to the Board of Trustees that the campaign had received about \$4,750,000 with the help of a generous bequest from Mr. George Todd.³⁹ When President Perry presented his eighteenth and last report to the trustees at the board meeting on May 19 he announced that the campaign stood at \$5,723,611.76, approximately 60 percent of its goal of \$10,000,000, and the Alumnae Fund was more than \$14,000 ahead of the year before.



Alumnae Fund boosters, 1979

It was already clear from these figures that however encouraging they might seem at first hearing, the campaign was not progressing at a propitious rate.

President Perry had announced his resignation effective June 30, 1973, and since the election of a new president could not possibly take place before the beginning of the 1973-74 college year, the trustees decided not to move the campaign outside the Baltimore area until the spring of 1974.

Whether or not Goucher could have prevented this fiscal crisis provided a continuing topic for debate, especially among the faculty, whose concerns mounted annually with the deficits. Though the assumption that the College had either not done enough to avert the deficits or had taken the wrong steps generally prevailed, little or no agreement about specific solutions to the problem emerged.

The general state of the economy, marked by rampant inflation coupled with a falling stock market produced the combination of rising expenses and diminished income that afflicted all private—and many public—institutions. In addition income from government sources decreased when education ceased to enjoy the priority status it had received during the post-*Sputnik* period. Added to the enrollment decline—itself sufficiently damaging to cause the demise of some institutions—the net effect for Goucher was devastating.

Conclusion

The Board of Trustees minutes for January 16, 1971, note that, according to President Perry:

The Carnegie Commission study and the American Council on Education survey both point out that most private colleges are in definite financial trouble: "serious" if not yet generally "desperate." Most colleges surveyed reported a modest surplus in 67-68, were in the red in 68-69, and *quintupled* their deficits in 69-70. Goucher showed a \$20,000 surplus in 67-68, a deficit of \$77,269 in 68-69, and a deficit of \$218,053 in 69-70. General causes continue to be inflation, poor stock market with resultant lower income from gifts and endowment, and the continuing rise in costs.⁴⁰

What was the College's response to this situation? To increase income, the College raised tuition and fees as often and as much as possible without affecting enrollment so adversely as to cancel the benefits. To reduce expenditures, the College made drastic economies in departmental and office budgets, reducing the annual increase to 3 percent in 1971-72, a very small fraction of the rise in costs at the time. Despite the difficulties in raising funds in such an economically troubled period, the College mounted a \$10,000,000 campaign, even though the series of budget deficits presented a less than alluring picture to prospective contributors and in spite of the national decrease in giving because of prevailing economic conditions.

Only when these measures failed to stop the deficits did the Board of Trustees, which feared it would exhaust those endowment funds it was legally entitled to spend, resort to the faculty reductions whose implementation would eventually become the responsibility of the new president.

What might Goucher have done that it did not do? Should the College at least have implemented some of these measures earlier? Could more foresight at the time have significantly changed the eventual outcome? The question of whether or not Goucher could have prevented the near disaster that loomed in 1972-73 and lasted well beyond may never be answered. Nonetheless, the fact that Goucher survived a nearly catastrophic situation once again should be grounds for thanksgiving,⁴¹ especially in a period that found the best analysts caught in a financial whirlwind that made virtually impossible accurate predictions of income and expenditures or, indeed, any clear discrimination between economic mirage and reality.



A Final Overview of the Perry Years

Each of the three administrations considered so far in this history had its own distinct problems, to which the three presidents responded in their individual styles. President Kraushaar's nineteen years were highly unusual, not only in the history of Goucher College, but in the history of American higher education as well. As he remarked in chapter 5, Dr. Kraushaar came to Goucher "in a time of rapid growth in American education." The outstanding accomplishments recounted in part 2 depended both on his personal talents and on his exceptional opportunities. He benefited from the "period of prosperity" that fell, in the words of the final report of the Carnegie Commission, between two periods of "genteel poverty" or—to use another of the Commission's terms—between two economic "depressions."

The Robertson and Perry administrations, however, provide significant parallels: grave financial difficulties caused by similar economic frustrations—falling enrollments, a poor stock market, interest rates detrimental to the College, land sale problems, comparatively low faculty and staff salaries, insufficient endowment, and conditions unfavorable to fund-raising. Furthermore, the two presidents and their faculties chose to devote much of their attention to revitalizing the College's curriculum and restructuring its governance.

While the parallels between the Robertson and Perry years are impressive, the differences between them are even more so. The Goucher students of the late sixties and early seventies were obviously not all radical, but they grew up in a period in which they and their contemporaries, highly concerned with social and political injustices of all kinds, especially opposed all military involvements. In the Robertson period the students made great efforts to support the Allied struggle in the Second World War, and because the faculty, administration, and trustees

*Similarities
and Differences
between the
Robertson
and Perry Eras*

fully endorsed the student viewpoint, their shared patriotism united the College in a profoundly felt moral cause. The Vietnam War, and particularly the invasion of Cambodia, had a very different impact on the students of the sixties. The effects of the generation gap were much more apparent; atomic weapons added frightening dimensions to questions of war and peace; and the impact of the mass media was profound—the students of the Robertson era had no television. Consequently, the generally good-natured acceptance of the status quo that preceded and followed the highly active, patriotic response to the Second World War became, in the Perry years, only a memory.

Although the faculty and administration in the late sixties and early seventies shared, in some measure, the students' concerns about a number of current ethical questions, from the activist students' point of view, the faculty—and more especially the administration—constituted part of the Establishment and therefore became automatically suspect. Furthermore, students of this generation often, though not always, manifested less patience and tolerance than their teachers, deans, and presidents. In short, the preponderant student outlook during the Perry years was drastically different from what it had been during the Robertson period and more at variance with the majority viewpoint of the faculty and administration.

The way the Perry administration handled curricular and governance reform differed profoundly from the Robertson period. In 1934, as in 1968, the president and the faculty worked together to bring about revisions in the academic program and the system of College government; but in 1934 the College did not seriously involve students in the deliberations. In 1968 and the years following, student views strongly influenced the ultimate decisions. What led, in fact, to the creation of the College Assembly was the students' insistence on their right to be heard.

Clearly, student contributions to the debates were often very valuable, especially within the subcommittees of the Committee on the Future of the College. However, the emotionally charged atmosphere of the period, generated by preoccupations both related and unrelated to College affairs, impelled undergraduates to adopt a sometimes strident form of rhetoric not conducive to clear analytical thinking about the long-range consequences of the changes they hoped to introduce. The accusation by the Students' Organization and the senior class of 1969 that the faculty had proved unprofessional and dishonorable when it chose not to change the graduation requirements for the class of 1969 one month before commencement is a notable example. The faculty was split on many of the issues as well, but that this student display of emotion did not favorably impress the majority of the faculty or administration is hardly surprising. It certainly did not knit the College together.

Unlike the faculty of the thirties, which accepted as best it could the economic strictures posed by the Great Depression and voted its own four-year salary reduction, the faculty of the Perry years, though regularly briefed by the president and the financial vice president on the economic situation of the College and of higher education in general, showed no strong desire to make financial sacrifices for the sake of the College. When, in one faculty meeting, a member reminded her colleagues of the salary cut voted by the faculty during the Robertson years,

her implied suggestion received no positive response. Rather, the prevailing tendency was to criticize the administration or the Board of Trustees for having somehow provoked the current financial crisis, or at least for having failed to deal with it satisfactorily.

The nature of the Robertson and Kraushaar periods warranted an initial general overview followed by an essentially chronological approach to a variety of themes, characterizing the earlier chapters of this history. During the Perry administration, on the other hand, specific problems so engrossed the members of the community that little time remained for unrelated activities. Nonetheless, in the late sixties and early seventies, the trustees and the administration necessarily coped with matters not immediately involved with fiscal solvency; the faculty discussed topics unrelated to governance or curricular changes; and while student life, at least as *Weekly* reflected it, seemed almost entirely tied up in social and political causes, one student triumph lifted the spirit of the entire community: the victory of the undefeated team which, after five weeks on national television, won the coveted College Bowl.

Goucher's College Bowl team made its first appearance on national television on February 9, 1969.¹ We have seen in chapter 12 that a similar team won its first three encounters ten years earlier, only to go down to defeat on its fourth attempt. Since the program stipulated that any team winning five straight victories automatically retired as undefeated champion, we can easily imagine the excitement when *Weekly* announced on February 28 that Goucher's College Bowl team had beaten High Point College, Louisiana State University, Wesleyan University, and Gonzaga University and now faced its final match with Sweet Briar College. When the Goucher team won its fifth and last contest, the trustee Executive Committee passed a resolution in its honor,² and in keeping with the team's suggestion, its winnings of \$19,500 were later combined with subsequent contributions to endow the 1969 College Bowl Scholarship. Over the summer, contributions increased the total to approximately \$27,000;³ by late October the scholarship fund had exceeded its goal of \$30,000.⁴

The College Bowl Victory

One year after the retirement of President Kraushaar, Dean Geen announced that she would retire in June, 1968.⁵ Her retirement marked the end of the eighteen-year tenure of one of Goucher's truly outstanding and memorable deans. Dr. Perry appointed a faculty committee to advise him on his nomination of a successor to Dean Geen,⁶ and on January 20, 1968, he informed the Board of Trustees that on the recommendation of the faculty advisory committee, he nominated Dr. Rhoda M. Dorsey as dean and vice president. The board promptly approved Dr. Dorsey's appointment.⁷

The Board of Trustees and the Administration

Several events enhanced the end of President Perry's first year.⁸ The presidential inauguration took place with appropriately colorful pageantry on Friday, May 3, 1968, and a month later, at the commencement ceremonies on June 9, Goucher conferred honorary degrees on Mr. H. Vernon Eney, trustee and College counsel, and on President Emeritus

Otto F. Kraushaar. The following year, at the commencement exercises on June 15, 1969, the College bestowed an honorary degree on Dean Emeritus Elizabeth Geen.

On January 8, 1968, the Executive Committee decided to retain Mr. Robert Geddes of Princeton as architect of the proposed fine arts building. Although no funds were available for construction, the committee reiterated, on September 22, 1969, its commitment to the principle of the fine arts building and voted to proceed with working drawings costing approximately \$70,000.⁹ At the same meeting the Executive Committee approved the dedication of the Robertson wing of the Julia Rogers Library, to take place on October 25.

When, in 1970, the trustees decided to incorporate the Board of Overseers within their own board, President Perry informed the Executive Committee that the overseers, consulted individually, had expressed pleasure at the prospect of their forthcoming status as full trustees. The unification of the Boards took place on February 1, 1971.¹⁰

Less than a month earlier, on January 16 Dr. Perry informed the Board of Trustees that he had received an invitation to become president of another college, but had decided to decline. Two years later, President Perry received another invitation to become president of a college, Agnes Scott, and this time he responded favorably. On April 2, 1973, the Executive Committee, on behalf of the Board of Trustees, accepted with deep regret President Perry's resignation, effective June 30.

At the same meeting Mr. Walter Sondheim, chairman of the Board of Trustees, distributed a draft letter to the president of the Students' Organization describing the proposed composition of a Search Committee for a new president. The current by-laws of the College called for a committee composed of four trustees, including at least one alumna, and three members of the faculty elected by their peers. The Executive Committee, Mr. Sondheim announced, would recommend to the board the addition of two representatives of the administration and two students to be selected by the student body from the senior and/or junior classes. The Executive Committee then approved the proposed changes in the by-laws.

In light of Dr. Perry's resignation, Mr. John Henry, Director of College Relations and Development, proposed, and the committee adopted, certain changes in the future course of the capital campaign. Hoping to complete the Baltimore stage of the campaign before President Perry's departure, Mr. Henry recommended postponing the national phase, involving principally alumnae solicitations, from its original starting date of September 1973 to one year later, when a new president would be in office. Meanwhile, during the academic year 1973-74, the fund-raising effort would concentrate on major and special prospects, on national corporations and general welfare foundations, and would continue more extensively the Goucher Now program, a traveling presentation involving several Goucher representatives designed to reach areas of high alumnae concentration throughout the nation.

On May 19, 1973, Mr. Sondheim advised the Board of Trustees that Dean Rhoda Dorsey would be acting president of the College and that Professor Kenneth Walker would be acting dean, both appointments effective June 15. On June 25, on recommendation of Acting President

Dorsey, the Executive Committee changed Mr. Henry's title from Director of College Relations and Development to Vice President for Development and Public Relations.

While approval and implementation of the new curricular reforms and changes in governmental structure occupied much of the Faculty's time and energy during the Perry years, several other actions and events concerning the faculty deserve mention.

President Perry announced on October 14, 1967, that the program of interinstitutional cooperation involving Goucher, Loyola, Morgan, and Towson State would go into operation in January 1968.

In October 1971 the faculty suffered the loss, within a space of one week, of two of its most respected colleagues. Memorial services were held in Haebler Memorial Chapel on October 8 for William L. Neumann, professor of history, and on October 15 for Walter E. Morris, professor of religion.

After months of debate, motions, amendments, and counter-amendments, the Faculty finally approved on November 10, 1971, a system of course evaluations to be conducted under the aegis of the Committee on Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure.

On September 5, 1972, the Faculty adopted a motion to extend the vote in its meetings to faculty members with the rank of instructor who were in their first year of service, subject to necessary action by the Board of Trustees to change the relevant by-laws; and on October 25 the Faculty voted to constitute an *ad hoc* committee on grievance mechanisms to investigate the desirability of establishing a Faculty Grievance Committee.

Perhaps the most significant development with regard to the faculty in the Perry years was the degree to which it changed in outlook. Over the course of many years, all faculties undergo certain changes in viewpoint—as, indeed, they must if they are not to lose touch entirely with their students, who also change from generation to generation; but rarely has there occurred such a remarkable *volte-face* in a short space of time as the one that took place between 1960 and 1975.

The dramatic upheaval in worldwide attitudes discussed in chapter 13 was almost certainly, like all revolutions, the cataclysmic outcome of a long evolutionary phase in which pent-up feelings reached a point at which only an explosion could release the accumulated pressure. Even in cases in which the pressure was less extreme—and Goucher College was probably such an instance—the detonation elsewhere created a sufficient echo to bring about a shift in student outlook that lasted for more than a decade. Moreover, many of the faculty who came to the College in the sixties and early seventies were young enough to identify with the student revolution, having lived their earlier lives through the evolutionary phase that preceded it. Small wonder, therefore, that a split occurred between the generations represented in the faculty, just as it did in society as a whole.

Much of this is evident in the events recounted in the two preceding chapters. The outspoken student demands were widely supported by the student body as a whole; the students were, after all, of a single generation. The faculty's response was, for many reasons, split: not just

The Faculty

*The Perry
Administration*

by the different ages of its members, though that had a visible effect, but also because the older faculty had had enough experience of both changing student values and of the changing circumstances underlying them to be torn between arguments from the past and from the present. This ambivalence among some of the more senior faculty members, combined with the outlook of the younger members, may have produced the final, largely favorable, response to the report of the Committee on the Future of the College. In any event it is clear that the faculty as a whole underwent significant change during the Perry years from what it had been in the mid-Kraushaar era. There remained, however, that basic unity manifest in the concern for undergraduate teaching, academic standards, and scholarly productivity that, tying together all generations of Goucher faculty and students, is basically responsible for the reputation of a College that has, for one hundred years, absorbed change without altering its essential nature.

*The End of the Perry
Administration*

At the faculty meeting of May 25, 1973, Professor Brooke Peirce presented an eloquent testimonial to President Perry and moved that the text be incorporated in the permanent record of the meeting in gratitude to Marvin Banks Perry, Jr. The motion, seconded, was adopted by acclamation. In response, President Perry expressed his admiration for the faculty and the College and urged loyal support of the acting president and the acting dean, and continued faith in the future of the College.

P a r t F o u r



T h e D o r s e y
A d m i n i s t r a t i o n
(1 9 7 3 -)





*A New President
Faces Old
Challenges
(1973 – 1979)*

W

hen Rhoda Mary Dorsey became acting president of the College, a national search had begun for a new president. It concluded on April 15, 1974, when Dr. Dorsey herself was elected eighth president of Goucher College, the first woman to hold that office.¹

The change in Goucher's administration had no discernible effect on the national economic situation, and Acting President Dorsey faced exactly the same dismal picture her predecessor had confronted for the previous five years. By the end of fiscal 1972–73, the total accumulated deficit had reached \$1,258,000; moreover, as the deficit continued to rise, enrollments—always the key to a balanced budget—continued to fall, as table 8 illustrates.

On September 4, 1973, 241 new freshmen had enrolled, compared with 277 in 1971 and 281 in 1972. From these figures and the table of deficits from 1968–69 through 1972–73 (see table 7), it could be concluded that the budgeted deficit for 1973–74 (\$425,819) would be exceeded, possibly by a substantial amount. While the basic fiscal soundness of the College remained, it could not continue if this pattern of deficits went unchecked.²

Accordingly, the Board of Trustees took action. On September 22 Mr. Nicholas Petrou, chairman of the board's Financial Planning Committee, called his colleagues' attention to the significant drop in full-time equivalent enrollments and noted that the College faced a deficit exceeding even the one already budgeted. Accordingly, he said, the Financial Planning Committee had undertaken a calculated reduction in budgeted expenses for 1973–74. By the next board meeting, Mr. Petrou expected the committee to have begun work on a five-year plan that would at last put an end to the series of deficits. At the board meeting held on October 13, Mr. Petrou presented the committee's interim re-

*The Continuing
Struggle to Balance
the Budget*



President Rhoda M. Dorsey, 1973–

port on eliminating the deficits by 1975–76. “This plan,” he said, “involves reductions of faculty, staff and administration, as well as increases in Goucher’s tuition by 10 percent in 1974–75, and 6 percent in 1975–76.” In the words of one trustee, the board regarded the plan to eliminate deficits in two years as “a very positive action.”³

At the Faculty meeting held on October 17, Richard R. Palmer, vice president for financial affairs, elaborated on the trustees’ plan for dealing with the College’s fiscal problems. He first reviewed the current situation, noting that before the budget could be balanced, he expected the total accumulated deficit to rise from the present figure of \$1.26 million to nearly \$1.8 million. The anticipated deficit for 1973–74 was \$425,000, but the real deficit would probably exceed \$500,000, pri-

Table 8 First Term Total Full-Time-Equivalent
Enrollments, 1968–75

Academic Year	FTE Enrollments
1968–69	1,057
1969–70	1,052
1970–71	1,044
1971–72	1,030
1972–73	992
1973–74	953
1974–75	921

Source: Office of the Registrar.

marily because of decreasing second semester enrollments. At this rate, the College would exhaust its entire expendable endowment by the end of 1973–74. The gradual enrollment decline from 1,023 in 1968–69 to 942 in the fall of 1973 represented a loss of over \$300,000 in income, and there was no guarantee that future enrollments would increase. For these reasons, the Financial Planning Committee of the board had mandated balancing the budget as soon as possible within the five-year plan. To comply with this mandate, the following steps would be taken:

1. Cut expenses in all possible budget areas, including personnel reductions in all divisions of the College
2. Permit no increases in non-fixed cost items of the 1974–75 budget
3. Reduce non-fixed costs wherever possible
4. Provide no salary increases the following year for faculty or administrative staff
5. Raise tuition by 10.2 percent
6. Revise the investment objectives of the College portfolio to maximize short-term yield over the next one to two years⁴
7. Increase year-round utilization of the physical plant⁵

On October 17, 1973, President Dorsey appointed an *ad hoc* Faculty Committee on Program Reduction to help develop guidelines on what might and should be done in case financial exigency made it necessary to reduce the faculty of the College.

One month later Mr. Walter Sondheim, chairman of the Board of Trustees, proposed to the Executive Committee that the following resolution be presented to the full board at its special meeting to be held later the same day: "The Board delegates to the Executive Committee the power to revise the investment policy of the College to provide whatever amount is required as operating revenue, and to instruct the administration of the College to exercise all feasible means, using the plan developed by the Financial Planning Committee as a guideline, to balance the operating budget by fiscal 1975–76."⁶ When the Executive Committee endorsed Mr. Sondheim's resolution unanimously, the die was cast: the seemingly unstoppable deficit budgeting would, in fact, end.

Action to implement the mandate began immediately. In order to meet the board's requirement, the Financial Planning Committee and the administration decided to reduce the operating expense budget for the current year by \$105,000.⁷ As a result of the economy drive, the 1973–74 deficit was reduced from \$425,000 to \$398,913, but this amount, added to the deficits of the five preceding years, raised the total accumulated deficit to \$1,655,917. Even more ominous was the state of the expendable endowment, which, by June 30, 1974, had dropped to \$77,000.⁸ In light of these figures, Mr. Petrou called to the attention of the board a projected \$100,000 shortage in income for 1975–76 which would have to be made up by reductions in personnel; half this amount would involve cuts in the size of the faculty.⁹

Once the administration and the Board of Trustees had decided to reduce the faculty, President Dorsey and the College's new dean and vice president, James Billet, met to decide which faculty positions the College would terminate. Subsequently, the president informed the individ-

ual faculty involved and then advised the full faculty about the situation. In accordance with a proposal from the local chapter of the American Association of University Professors, which the president accepted, the Faculty formed an *ad hoc* Review Committee to study the proposed cuts. The committee's charge was either to approve the announced cuts or to suggest alternatives. Meanwhile, Dean Billet had begun to prepare a longer-range plan concerning curriculum and staff within the constraints of the budget, his decisions to be forwarded with all available relevant materials to the *ad hoc* committee in February 1975. On advice of the (trustee) Faculty Personnel Policies Committee, the president recommended to the Executive Committee that a procedure be established involving a faculty grievance committee to hear all faculty complaints. In certain areas cases might move from the grievance committee to a committee of the board. Having heard President Dorsey's explanation, the Board of Trustees voted to authorize the Executive Committee to approve the establishment of a grievance procedure as recommended.¹⁰

Dean Billet outlined for the Board of Trustees on January 11, 1975, the general strategy the administration planned to adopt in an effort to stem an enrollment decline that showed no sign of abating. The only way to attract more students, the dean suggested, would be to accommodate to some degree the prevailing pre-college and undergraduate preoccupation with career preparation. Eliminating certain departments and programs involving tenured faculty would be necessary; at the same time, the College would introduce new programs funded by both old and new resources. The administration would effect these changes as rapidly as possible over the next two years.¹¹

At the Executive Committee meeting on February 17, "Mr. Sondheim expressed concern for certain faculty members now tenured who would no longer be employed by the College when contemplated changes in the curriculum became effective. This concern was shared by all members of the Executive Committee, who agreed to help where possible find employment for such persons whose positions are terminated."¹²

Prior to Christmas 1974 the plan had been to cut \$100,000 from the budget; by February, with admissions applications running far below the year before, the projected average enrollment for 1975-76 was 805. The amount to be cut from the budget was therefore increased to \$294,000.¹³

Dr. Dorsey spoke to the Faculty on March 5, 1975, about the proposals for reducing the faculty's size. In 1975-76, she said, one full-time position would be terminated in each of the following departments: English, Mathematics, Philosophy, Physical Education, and Education. In 1976-77 the College would terminate both full-time positions in Classics and one position in each of the following departments or sections: German, French, Physics, and Religion. In the Department of Biological Sciences a coordinated series of unpaid leaves over two years would be followed by a retirement and the termination of the vacated position. Separated faculty would be given all possible help in finding positions outside the College.

Subsequently, certain faculty members expressed concern to the chairman of the Board of Trustees about the decision to eliminate course

offerings in Classics. "The Executive Committee," the minutes record, "received the suggestions with appreciation."¹⁴

When the administration reached its decisions concerning the cuts to be made in the tenured faculty, the *ad hoc* Faculty Review Committee interviewed all department chairmen involved and any faculty members who wished to talk with the committee. The committee then made counterproposals to the administration which were considered and accepted. As matters stood, the most significant reductions in 1976-77 would involve tenured faculty, including elimination of the entire Department of Classics and the majors in Physics and German, resulting in the termination of two faculty positions in Classics and one each in Physics and German, as well as one position in French.¹⁵ Speaking to the Board of Trustees on May 10, President Dorsey stressed an important point: "We are cutting into the quality of the College—not so much by the elimination of one area of the academic program, but in the establishment of a budget that is tight in the extreme, that leaves the College with reduced staffing, and that strains existing staff to the point of exhaustion and sometimes to the point of despair. Any institution with strength and inner confidence can take take this for a time, but not forever; it is the responsibility of all Trustees to remember this."¹⁶

By the opening of the College year in 1975, the financial situation was under control; for the first time in seven years, 1974-75 ended with a surplus of about \$1,000, but progress had been less marked in dealing with the enrollment problem. Although the interest in early graduation had slowed, the number of entering students continued to drop, as shown in table 9.

On October 18 the Finance Committee reported to the Board of Trustees that year-to-date investment results showed a return of 13 percent on a market value of \$9,439,109 for the College endowment fund. Mr. Petrou reported a projected balanced budget for fiscal 1975-76 and cumulatively for the next five years. The fiscal year 1975-76 actually ended with a surplus of \$5,051; this came about despite a projected deficit of \$67,493 and represented a second consecutive year of small operating surpluses after six consecutive years of substantial operating deficits. Unfortunately, projections for 1976-77 included a \$197,000 deficit, with a decreased fall semester enrollment. In October 1976 the College's expendable endowment was \$220,000, and the future outlook, based on a level enrollment of 750, indicated further budgeted operating deficits in the absence of additional income or reduced costs.¹⁷ The College treasurer, Mr. George Thomsen, had earlier

Table 9 Entering Freshmen, 1970-75

Year	Entering Freshmen
1970	318
1971	276
1972	281
1973	249
1974	244
1975	230

Source: Minutes of the Board of Trustees, October 18, 1975.

noted that as of late May 1976, the expendable endowment stood at \$500,000. If Goucher spent \$197,000 of this amount, 40 percent of the expendable endowment, then at that rate the College would be out of business in two and a half years.¹⁸

Following the recommendation of the Faculty Review Committee, President Dorsey and Dean Billet proposed terminating, in addition to both members of the Classics Department (Professors Chester F. Natunewicz and Robert C. Schmiel), one tenured faculty member each in French and German.¹⁹ Using Goucher's five criteria for faculty excellence,²⁰ Dean Billet discussed with the Executive Committee all faculty members in these disciplines and named the two—Associate Professor Hertha Krotkoff in German and Assistant Professor John K. Donaldson, Jr. in French—that he and President Dorsey regretfully agreed must be terminated. The Executive Committee voted to endorse this recommendation.²¹

Response to the elimination of the Classics Department and the termination of several tenured faculty took various forms. On November 10, 1975, the Executive Committee discussed a recent series of letters to the editor of the Baltimore *Sun* that seriously criticized Goucher and its administration for planning to eliminate the Classics Department. The Executive Committee was concerned about how Goucher could make clear to the public the reasons for such a decision. Recognizing that a letter from Goucher to the *Sun* would not be helpful since the College's position had already been fully explained in that forum, the committee decided that at least the rest of the trustees, not all of whom lived in or near Baltimore, should receive another letter explaining the College's point of view.

Meanwhile, Professors Krotkoff and Donaldson took their cases to the Faculty Grievance Committee, from which these issues moved to the trustee Panel on Grievances. On March 1, 1976, the panel recommended to the Executive Committee that it concur in the president's decision not to reappoint Professor Krotkoff. The Executive Committee adopted this recommendation unanimously. The panel made no recommendation at this time in the case of Professor Donaldson, having agreed to refer the matter back to the Faculty Grievance Committee for further consideration and action.

On April 19 the Panel on Grievances called the Executive Committee's attention to the procedures the dean had followed in reaching his recommendation—in which the president concurred—that Professor Donaldson be terminated. Mr. Donaldson had filed a grievance containing two parts: (1) that the procedures culminating in his termination were inappropriate, and (2) that he should not have been the faculty member terminated. The Faculty Grievance Committee ultimately declared that it found the procedures which led to Mr. Donaldson's termination inappropriate, but it declined to consider which faculty member should be terminated. Since the trustee panel could only hear issues on which the Faculty Grievance Committee had reached a decision, the panel could make no recommendation on Mr. Donaldson's second point. On the first point, it recommended that the Executive Committee concur in the procedures adopted by the administration in reaching its

decision to terminate Professor Donaldson. The Executive Committee adopted this recommendation unanimously.

Meeting on May 22, the Board of Trustees dealt with the implications of the termination of tenured faculty. In response to a question, Dean Billet explained that the original purpose of tenure was to provide a faculty member a guarantee of academic freedom and to prevent termination for reasons other than cause or financial exigency. Mr. Eney, the College counsel, noted that while tenure was not defined in the College by-laws, he assured the trustees that Dean Billet's description was correct. In Mr. Eney's opinion this meant that a faculty member who had tenure could not be released as long as the College had need of him or her, but Mr. Eney did not feel that faculty had to be retained if, because of curricular or enrollment changes, such faculty were not needed. President Dorsey noted that policy statements concerning terminations resulting from financial exigency that had been made by the American Association of University Professors during the past two to three years had not been endorsed by the American Council on Education or by the Association of American Colleges; therefore Goucher, as a college, was not bound by these policy statements.²²

As a result of their terminations, three faculty members filed suit against the College. The Board of Trustees had received a recommendation from the Executive Committee on May 22, 1976, not to settle out of court on any pending case, a decision that was reaffirmed by the Executive Committee on December 6.

Professor Donaldson filed a suit in state court but delayed bringing it to trial pending decisions in the other cases. Ultimately, his suit was dropped.²³

Professor Chester Natunewicz also brought suit in state court, but the trial was delayed.²⁴ Although Mr. Natunewicz had found employment, he continued his suit, later scheduled to be heard on March 10 and 11, 1977. After a two-and-a-half-day trial held in Towson in May 1977, Judge Frank E. Cicone found Goucher College not guilty of the charges brought against it by Professor Natunewicz. There was no appeal.²⁵

The third case was much more protracted. Professor Krotkoff, since she was not an American citizen, brought suit in federal court, beginning with a request for a preliminary injunction that led to a week of hearings in August 1976. Mrs. Krotkoff's request was denied, and the suits she had brought against individual members of the Board of Trustees were dropped at the end of the hearings. The suit against the College was scheduled to go before a jury in December 1976.²⁶ The trial date was later postponed to May 2, 1977, when it was heard before Judge R. Dorsey Watkins and a jury in the United States District Court for the District of Maryland.²⁷ Four points were argued by Mrs. Krotkoff's lawyer: (1) tenure guarantees a recipient a position until age sixty-five barring dismissal for cause, notwithstanding financial conditions or program changes within the institution; (2) Mrs. Krotkoff was the wrong person among the two tenured members of the German section to be selected for termination; (3) questions were raised about the definition and extent of financial exigency; and (4) questions were raised concerning the attempts of the College to find reemployment at the

Litigation Involving the College

College for Mrs. Krotkoff. When the jury found in favor of Mrs. Krotkoff and awarded her \$180,000, Goucher's lawyers asked Judge Watkins to set aside the verdict, which he did in a hearing held on July 12, 1977. In his oral opinion Judge Watkins stated that "Unfortunately, I feel that in this case, the verdict is against the clear weight of the evidence and that it will result, if permitted to stand, in a miscarriage of justice. . . ." ²⁸ Commenting on the four points raised by the plaintiff, Judge Watkins said: "I . . . find as a fact and conclude as a matter of law that financial exigency or the elimination of a department or of a course was a justifiable basis for the termination of the incumbent in that occupation or department, provided that the termination was bona fide, that it was done for reasons of reorganization of the university and not to get anybody, and not because of a desire to cut down generally on tenured faculty." ²⁹ Amplifying this point, Judge Watkins noted that all sides agreed that the trustees had acted in good faith and that "there was certainly very substantial evidence that financial conditions at Goucher were worsening and had worsened, there certainly was adequate evidence to justify the finding that there was a financial exigency." ³⁰ Judge Watkins further found that there was significant evidence in support of the choice of the person to be terminated, ³¹ and that the College had done what it could to find a suitable alternative position for Mrs. Krotkoff. "Incidentally," he concluded, "I think the testimony was quite clear that there was no legal obligation to retrain a displaced tenured faculty member." ³² Thus, Judge Watkins found for the College on all four points raised by the plaintiff.

Mrs. Krotkoff appealed to the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals in Richmond, Virginia. In October 1978 the court affirmed the judgment of the lower court, thereby finding in Goucher's favor. ³³ That decision concluded the litigation brought about by the terminations of tenured faculty in 1975.

*Light At the End
of the Tunnel*

Faculty reduction was by no means the only approach the trustees took in dealing with the budget crisis. Energy, particularly fuel oil, constitutes one of the College's most significant items of expenditure, and in 1973 the nation experienced a fuel shortage that nearly forced the College to close temporarily. President Dorsey assured the Executive Committee on December 10 that Goucher was making sure that heat and light were not wasted. The College had enough fuel to last until about the middle of January, and the fuel dealer was optimistic about future supplies, but if the College were to run dangerously low on oil, it would close at that time and resume again when adequate fuel was on hand. Fortunately, this situation did not come about, but strong measures were taken to reduce energy consumption. In this instance the fuel shortage, rather than its cost, led to curtailed use of heat and electricity, but later in the decade the price of fuel became the overriding factor, though shortages continued to cause concern. During the period between the January and spring terms of 1977, when no students were in residence, some buildings had thermostats set at fifty-five degrees, saving 9,500 to 12,000 gallons of oil and three to four thousand dollars. Residence thermostats were later set at sixty-five degrees in hope of saving 20–30 percent on energy. ³⁴

A year later the Finance Committee approved hiring a consultant, ThERM, Inc. (The Energy Resources Management Company), whose study would cost \$48,000 the first year and up to \$18,000 the second year, depending on what remained to be done. ThERM expected resulting energy cost savings to be \$70,000 a year with no major capital expenses.³⁵ As a result of ThERM's work, oil usage dropped 9 percent, electricity 15 percent, and gas 9 percent between January and June 1978, for a saving of \$27,000.³⁶

In an effort to increase income, the Executive Committee approved a plan on January 21, 1974, to convert the entire investment portfolio into bonds, principally utility bonds, and short-term reserves; furthermore, the national phase of the campaign was scheduled to begin its alumnae solicitations on October 2, 1974. By mid-February 1974 campaign pledges totalled \$7,000,000. While national alumni/alumnae support for colleges represented about 16–18 percent, Goucher alumnae support had been running 50–53 percent.³⁷ On May 5, 1975, the Executive Committee voted to close the campaign on June 30, 1975, even though it had not reached its goal of \$10 million.³⁸ The total finally raised amounted to \$9,078,705.37, nearly a million dollars short of the goal.

While all these efforts to increase income were laudatory, the root of the matter continued to be enrollments. On March 24 Vice President for Development John Henry reported to the Executive Committee on favorable comments the College had received on its recruitment advertisements currently running in *The New Yorker* and *Newsweek*. "These ads have produced some inquiries from potential students," Mr. Henry said. They did not, however, prove to be a bonanza. The enrollment situation remained cloudy; President Dorsey expressed concern to the Executive Committee on July 12, 1976, about the decrease in applications from Maryland, especially Baltimore students. Various organizational shifts would be made to address this problem, she promised. When the College opened in September, the decline in enrollments that had begun in 1969 had not yet ended; 209 freshmen had entered the College, compared with 266 in 1974, and the current FTE count was 819, compared with 903 in 1975. Accordingly, the College raised tuition and fees for both 1977–78 and 1978–79 to help increase income.³⁹

At last, in 1977, enrollments began to improve. As of September 1 Goucher had an enrollment of 888 as compared to 819 the year before.⁴⁰ By the following September the outlook was even brighter, as indicated in table 10.

As enrollments improved, so did the budgets, largely as a result of deferred maintenance. The 1976–77 budget deficit was \$66,524, but 1977–78 ended with a \$10,000 surplus, and 1978–79 produced a

Table 10 First Semester Enrollment Figures, 1976–78

	Fall 1976	Fall 1977	Fall 1978
FTE	819	893	944
Headcount	899	970	1,023
Freshmen	209	282	296

Source: Minutes of the Board of Trustees, September 30, 1978.



Studio art class, late 1970s

surplus of \$38,000.⁴¹ As the operating budgets returned to the black, the endowment also increased, the portfolio passing \$14,000,000 in September 1978, and falling just short of \$15,000,000 one year later.⁴²

Meanwhile, the senior staff and the assistant to the president began work, in conjunction with the trustee Priorities and Planning Committee, on a five-year long-range plan that was expected to produce results affecting the 1979–80 budget.⁴³

On November 6, 1979, the Executive and Development Committees of the board met jointly to consider a campaign. Goucher's long-range plan called for improvements that would cost \$17.5 million, and the College had retained Ketchum, Inc., to determine what portion of that could be met by special gifts, grants, and bequests in a campaign over the next five years. Ketchum's recommendation was to proceed at once to undertake a capital campaign with a goal of \$12 million. Mr. Donald DeVries, chairman of the Board of Trustees, expressed his disappointment with this recommendation. He felt that the \$12,000,000 goal was too low and based on an unduly pessimistic estimate of support. The increased strength of the College over the past several years should, he thought, generate more support than the recommendation suggested. Mr. Jack Pearlstone moved to raise the goal to \$14,000,000. When a vote was taken, the results favored Mr. Pearlstone's motion, but the 8–5 outcome represented an insufficient majority to warrant undertaking a campaign of such dimensions. The joint committee therefore decided to report its discussion and to refer final decision to the full Board of Trustees. It further voted to retain Ketchum, Inc., to direct the campaign. On January 7, 1980, the full board voted to approve the campaign, to be conducted under the leadership of Janet Jeffery Harris, '30, with a goal of \$14,000,000 and the theme For Women of Promise.



*Other
Developments in
the Life of
the College
(1 9 7 3 – 1 9 7 9)*

M

uch of the administration and the trustees' time during the first six years of the Dorsey administration was absorbed by the budget crisis and the ensuing litigation, but many other developments, not money-driven, occurred in the life of the institution during the same period: new senior administrators, decisions about the future of the College, trustee concerns about personnel policies, and student life activities.¹

A number of changes took place in the College's senior staff between 1973 and 1979, the most important, of course, being the election of Goucher's first woman president. After a national search for the best candidate, the Presidential Search Committee recommended Dr. Dorsey's election. Mr. Walter Sondheim, chairman of the Board of Trustees, said that he had asked Dr. Dorsey if she would be willing to accept the presidency if it were offered to her by the board. According to Mr. Sondheim, Dr. Dorsey replied that after thoughtful consideration, she would be pleased and honored to accept. She did, however, ask those trustees who voted for her election to do so only with the understanding that they would agree to work more actively in behalf of the College in a number of areas, but most importantly to strengthen the College's financial position. "Thereupon, upon motion made and duly seconded, it was unanimously voted to elect Dr. Rhoda M. Dorsey to the Office of President of Goucher College, effective as of the date of this meeting."² President Dorsey's inauguration took place on October 2, 1974, with A Celebration of Women as its theme.

*Administrative
Changes*

At the end of the 1973–74 academic year, Acting Dean Kenneth O. Walker, professor of history, chose early retirement, thereby bringing to a close a distinguished twenty-eight year career. A search had already

begun for a dean, and on September 9, 1974, Mr. Sondheim welcomed and introduced to the Executive Committee Goucher's new dean and vice president, Dr. James Billet, former assistant vice president for academic affairs at the State University College of Arts and Sciences at Geneseo, New York.

The Executive Committee minutes for December 1, 1975, record that "it is with great sadness that the Executive Committee heard from President Dorsey that Dean Martha Nichols plans to retire at the end of this academic year."³ In July 1976 Ms. Julie Collier-Adams assumed her duties as the new dean of students.

Finally, Mr. John J. Henry, vice president for development and public relations, resigned to become director of development for the National Symphony Orchestra. To replace him, President Dorsey appointed Patricia P. Purcell, former vice president for development at Wells College, to the corresponding position at Goucher.

The decisions taken in 1973 to cooperate with the Johns Hopkins University and remain a single-sex institution resulted from a process of self-assessment initiated by Goucher; four years later the College embarked on more formal kinds of self-assessment necessitated by the process of reaccreditation. First, the College's teacher-training program was re-evaluated by a visiting team in February 1977 as a preliminary step towards reaccreditation by the Maryland State Department of Education. Then, in November 1977, Goucher underwent an institution-wide evaluation by a committee representing the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, a process repeated every ten years. In preparation for the Middle States visit, the College undertook, in 1976-77, a self-study of the total institution to insure that it was run efficiently, in accordance with professional standards, and in a manner properly responsive to the four basic questions the visiting Middle States team would ask:

1. What are Goucher's objectives?
2. Are these objectives appropriate to Goucher at this time?
3. Are all Goucher programs and activities designed to achieve these objectives?
4. Are the resources available to carry through the programs and activities of the College, and will they continue to be available?

"The self-study," Dr. Dorsey explained to the Board of Trustees, "is under the direction of Professor Musser of our Modern Languages Department, aided by a steering committee of faculty, students, and administrators. Several committees have already been formed and are hard at work."⁴ In fact, ten committees gathered data and prepared preliminary reports for the Steering Committee. The self-study report, designed to be a candid analysis of the current condition of the College, included a statement of institutional goals and objectives and detailed chapters on the Goucher student, the curriculum and faculty, the College's financial and physical resources, the library, College governance and organization, and a discussion of outcomes of the overall program based on a recent alumnae survey, and an up-to-date record of undergraduate test-

ing by agencies external to the College. Copious tables and appendices provided the factual basis for the analytical evaluation. The completed self-study document was sent to the members of the visiting team six weeks before their arrival at the College in November 1977. In 1978 the Middle States Association formally reaffirmed Goucher's accreditation without qualification.

While the visiting team of the Middle States Association did not hesitate to reaffirm the accreditation of the College, it did comment on the demoralization of the faculty, noting that "this crisis in morale is the most serious problem we encountered on campus."⁵ Indeed, during the period 1973–79, faculty members became more and more concerned about their status at the College (particularly after the termination of several tenured faculty positions in 1975), and matters of tenure, grievance, and related topics became subjects of intense discussion in faculty meetings. At the same time, the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees had its own concerns about the faculty. On January 7, 1974, Acting Dean Kenneth Walker reported to the Executive Committee that an *ad hoc* trustee Committee on Trustee-Faculty Relations had held two meetings relating to faculty salaries; reappointment, promotion, and tenure; procedures for reduction of the academic program; "and such other matters as seem relevant to the maintenance of a sound personnel policy for the Goucher faculty to help maintain a sound academic program and ensure the fiscal viability of the College. [The *ad hoc* committee] shall also undertake to recommend a grievance procedure to ensure the right of appeal to individual faculty members who feel that their treatment has not been in accord with the established personnel procedures and policies of the College. It shall report to the Executive Committee with recommendations by May 1."⁶ Dean Walker further noted that the committee planned to consult with the Faculty Salaries Committee, the Committee on Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure, the *ad hoc* Committee on Reduction of the Academic Program, the *ad hoc* Committee on Grievance Mechanisms, and individual faculty and trustees.

On February 17, 1975, President Dorsey distributed to the Executive Committee copies of proposals from the Faculty Personnel Policies Committee (as it was now called) concerning (1) a grievance mechanism, (2) dismissal procedures, and (3) proposed principles for action by the Committee on Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure.

Later, Faculty II (History and the Social Sciences), expressing a sense that more communication was needed between the board and the faculty, addressed to Mr. DeVries a letter recommending faculty representation on the board. The Executive Committee referred this proposal to the (trustee) Faculty Personnel Policies Committee on September 10, 1979. On December 3 the Executive Committee approved a response from the Faculty Personnel Policies Committee recommending that faculty members not then be invited to become board members but that they be invited from time to time to board meetings to discuss "areas of concern."⁷

One of the most important issues facing the trustees as well as the faculty during these early years of the Dorsey administration was the

*Trustee Concerns
with Policies
Involving the Faculty*

question of tenure. The minutes of the Executive Committee for April 1, 1974, state that after lengthy discussion of the problem of tenure at Goucher in relation to the present financial situation of the College, the following policy was unanimously approved by the committee:

1. That the percentage of faculty on tenure be allowed to rise to 80 percent this year, in accordance with President Perry's policy statement of October 27, 1971. This means, specifically, that not more than four persons will receive tenure in the academic year 1975-76.
2. This year is the last of this policy.
3. The Faculty Personnel Policies Committee of the Board of Trustees will bring a new tenure policy to the Executive Committee for consideration by the summer of 1974.⁸

According to the minutes of the Executive Committee meeting of June 25, 1979, full-time tenured faculty had reached 81 percent in 1975-76, but it was projected that the percentage in 1979-80 would be reduced to 59 percent by natural attrition, through resignations, retirements, and nonrenewal of untenured appointments. In order to maintain flexibility in case of a needed faculty reduction, the Executive Committee had earlier reaffirmed a prior policy against allowing a department to become fully tenured, except in the most extraordinary circumstances.⁹ All these efforts were intended to provide a sufficient number of non-tenured faculty positions, including at least one in every department, to permit possible future reductions in the size of the faculty without the necessity of including tenured positions. Regrettably, this safeguard did not protect all tenured faculty in 1980.

On September 22, 1975, the Faculty approved a mechanism which the Executive Committee had accepted on September 8. The Faculty Grievance Committee heard its first two cases on February 21, 1976.

Goucher Awards

On May 15, 1978, the Faculty Personnel Policies Committee recommended to the Executive Committee that the College initiate its own faculty awards: five prizes of one thousand dollars each. Three of the prizes, one given in each of the Faculties of instruction, would reward excellence in teaching. The fourth prize would honor outstanding research or creativity, and the fifth would recognize outstanding service to the College. The prizes, which have become an annual event, are presented at the conclusion of commencement exercises; the list of faculty who have received the awards through 1985 is shown in table 11.

On August 26, 1978, as we have seen, eighteen buildings that had been part of the downtown campus were officially entered on the National Register of Historic Places,¹⁰ and the College itself won an award when, on May 7, 1979, Governor Harry Hughes presented to Goucher the Maryland Historical Trust's 1979 Calvert Prize for outstanding contributions made through the College's program in historic preservation.¹¹

On February 19, 1980, Professor Wolfgang E. Thormann, chairman of the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures, who had for many years brought Paris theatre to Goucher for the benefit, not only of Goucher students, but also of high school students throughout Maryland, was invested by M. Roland Husson of the French Embassy as a

Table 11 Distinguished Faculty Awards, 1979–85

1979:	Teaching, Faculty	I—Mary Hesky (English)
	Faculty	II—Ronald Krieger (Economics)
	Faculty	III—Helen Funk (Biological Sciences)
	Research or Creative Work—Marguerite Webb (Biological Sciences)	
	Service to the College—Barbara Long (Psychology) and Wolfgang Thormann (Modern Languages)	
1980:	Teaching, Faculty	I—Brooke Peirce (English)
	Faculty	II—Eli Velder (Education)
	Faculty	III—James L. A. Webb (Chemistry)
	Research or Creative Work—Rolf Muuss (Education)	
	Service to the College—Dorothy Bernstein (Mathematics) and Geraldine Coon (Mathematics)	
1981:	Teaching, Faculty	I—Fred White (English)
	Faculty	II—Jean Baker (History)
	Faculty	III—Robert Lewand (Mathematics)
	Research or Creative Work—Ruth Wylie (Psychology)	
	Service to the College—L. A. Walker (Chemistry) and Barton Houseman (Chemistry)	
1982:	Teaching, Faculty	I—Mary Rose (Philosophy)
	Faculty	II—Joe Hagan (International Relations)
	Faculty	III—Martin Berlinrood (Biological Sciences)
	Research or Creative Work—Jean Baker (History)	
	Service to the College—Sarah D. Jones (Librarian)	
1983:	Teaching, Faculty	I—Laurelynn Kaplan (English)
	Faculty	II—Katherine Shouldice (Economics)
	Faculty	III—George Delahunty (Biological Sciences)
	Research or Creative Work—Robert H. Lewis (Music)	
	Service to the College—Fontaine Belford, (Director, Goucher Center for Educational Resources)	
1984:	Teaching, Faculty	I—Wolfgang Thormann (French)
	Faculty	II—Julie Jeffrey (History)
	Faculty	III—Raymond Geremia (Mathematics)
	Service to the College—Jane Morrell (Education)	
1985:	Teaching, Faculty	I—Alma Nugent (English)
	Faculty	II—Sylvia Woodby (Politics and Public Policy)
	Faculty	III—Elaine Koppelman (Mathematics)
	Research or Creative Work—Esther Gibbs (Chemistry)	
	Service to the College—Frederic O. Musser (Modern Languages)	

Chevalier in the French Order of Academic Palms. The French government bestowed the order, which had been created by Napoleon in 1808, on Professor Thormann in recognition of his contributions to the spreading of French culture in Maryland.¹²

On the student scene the College newspaper, in keeping with the tone of the early seventies, changed its name on September 7, 1973, from the traditional *Weekly* to *Outcry*. A year and a half later the newspaper's

Student Life



Premedical student, 19708

editors decided that the publication's style did not really live up to its new title, so they reverted to *Weekly*, beginning with the issue of February 14, 1975. Three years later, on February 16, 1978, *Weekly* began publishing every other week—a policy that seemed once again to contradict its name; still, the students were reluctant to abandon the familiar title, so they compromised by printing a diagonal slash through the word “Weekly” and added a second line in smaller print: “A Fortnightly Publication.”¹³

Two matters of concern to the administration were the counseling of freshmen and the nature of the health services provided by the College. In September 1978 a new First Year Program began operation, its purpose to bring all counseling services to bear in a coordinated way on freshman-year problems, which faculty advisors and the student life staff recognized to be distinctive.¹⁴ Also in 1978 the high cost of operating the Health Center, combined with student wishes for health instruction and gynecological services, led to the appointment of a study committee composed of faculty, students, and the dean of students, with advice from a consultant. As a result of the study, a new health plan was implemented in the fall of 1979, ending the infirmary operation and shifting emphasis from bed-patient care to health education and consultation, with improved insurance coverage of the students. The savings occasioned by this change resulted in a decrease in the health fee.¹⁵

Student clubs continued to be active during this period, and one of them celebrated a notable event in April 1977: Dr. Marjorie Horning addressed the fiftieth annual banquet of the Chemistry Club in a year



Student in Van Meter art studio, late 1970s

that represented the eighty-fifth anniversary of the founding of Goucher's Chemical Association in 1892.¹⁶

In terms of purely social activities, student life continued to suffer from the lack of a true student center. After a series of coffee houses had failed, the student-staffed Goucher Gooch opened in Froelicher Hall amid hopes that it would enjoy a more successful future.¹⁷ Unfortunately, the Gooch followed the way of the coffee houses, and it became clear that more drastic steps had to be taken. After students had decided on the basic design, and an outside consultant had drawn up the plans, both students and administrators approved, in 1978, an interior design for the Greenhouse, an ambitious student center that would occupy the former dining room of Mary Fisher Hall.¹⁸ The Greenhouse prospered, but it still had difficulty competing with the Rathskeller of the Johns Hopkins University; it was not until the opening of the Pearlstone Center in Mary Fisher Hall in 1984 that students could boast of a really outstanding locus for their social life.¹⁹

A particularly important event of this period, one that was entirely student initiated, was the Student Rally on March 13, 1978, which emerged from a felt need to publicize a long list of dissatisfactions. According to the March 16, 1978, issue of *Weekly*, "organization of the Rally grew out of a 'meeting of minds' in Stimson Lounge on March 5." The president of the Students' Organization, Catherine ("Kitty") Bryant, met with class presidents and others to discuss "ways of promoting campus unity." At a subsequent meeting the group began discussing a "protest or demonstration of some sort."²⁰ This meeting took place

on Sunday night, March 12, and ended in the early hours of Monday morning. The fourteen organizers divided into groups, three students departing on Paul Revere rides to deliver handwritten letters to the homes of trustees, informing them of the rally and asking for their support. Others shoveled snow to clear the College Center courtyard where the rally was to take place. At daybreak students began bagging 450 lunches provided by Canteen, the College's food service, for the protesters. Over four hundred students turned up for the town meeting, at which students voiced a series of concerns ranging from College finances to the January Term, the shuttle service to Towson and the Johns Hopkins University, the freshman core course and the new humanities course (Arts and Ideas), the advising program, the Health Center, snow removal, and a number of other issues. President Dorsey addressed the gathering, promising "prompt and careful consideration of the concerns expressed by the students."²¹ Proving that she meant it, the President met with the rally organizers the next day and began to review a long list of issues that had emerged from the town meeting. "She suggested channels for further action and, in some cases, pledged her personal support to student proposals. According to Org President Kitty Bryant, Dorsey has vowed that 'nothing will get tabled.'"²² Dr. Dorsey met again with the rally leaders on March 15 for dinner and further discussion. "The Goucher President commented that she thought the rally was 'great,' and that 'by and large, the students are serious, constructive, and concerned.'"²³ Subsequent *Weekly* editions reflected the careful and thorough review of the student concerns and the actions taken wherever possible to alleviate or eliminate them. This protest proved to be a positive, creative, and unifying force that showed interest, involvement, and support of the College by its students.



*The Goucher
Academic Program
(1973 - 1985)*

T

he critical problem of falling enrollments, which had plagued Goucher from the beginning of the Perry administration, impelled the Dorsey administration to consider, as early as 1974, whether or not some refocusing of the curriculum might attract more matriculants. On March 10, 1975, the College Assembly met to discuss various curricular proposals before moving them to appropriate committees for detailed study. Speaking to the Assembly, Dean Billet noted that the proposed changes should be considered first in a financial context. He reminded his listeners that demographers had predicted, for the period from 1975 to 1978, a slowly increasing enrollment for both private and public institutions, followed by a slowly declining enrollment, chiefly because of changes in the population. The private sector would find itself more and more in a buyers' market between 1975 and 1990, with enrollments heavily dependent on satisfaction of student needs and desires. According to Dean Billet, "the Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates that in the period between 1978 and 1985, there will be a surplus of 700,000 graduates with Bachelor of Arts degrees entering the labor market. Although positions in the professions and skilled careers will show high growth (up to 50 percent) during this period, liberal arts graduates without additional training will experience difficulties with employers demanding specific career training, whether the employers are correct or incorrect in their views. Although positions in the traditional professions (law, medicine, research, and teaching in higher education) will continue to be available, a rational response to the demand for specially trained liberal arts graduates between 1975 and 1990 must be made."¹

*The Rationale
for Curricular Change
in the Seventies
and Eighties*

The March 7, 1975, issue of *Weekly* had provided descriptions of proposed new programs as well as details about the elimination of some existing ones. "The two kinds of proposals go together," Dean Billet

explained to the College Assembly, "because the trustees, legally responsible for the financial affairs of the College, have mandated a balanced budget for the existing programs while allowing some deficit spending for new programs only. This requires a cut of \$200,000 in the next two years in the instructional budget."²

Proposed changes in the academic objectives and programs for the future included, according to the dean, an emphasis on:

1. Literacy, the only business of the College, a part of *every* course, but especially of the proposed Core Course
2. The maintenance of intellectual values and of rigorous intellectual discipline as the significant basis for other programs, notably the departmental major, and for the specific needs of women students
3. Preparation for careers and for the professions (maintenance of the liberal arts commitment to graduate programs in law, medicine, and university teaching and research), but including also preparation and training for students with varied interests in objectives other than the life of the mind *per se*
4. Attention to the needs of women of all ages who are interested in life-long learning and opportunities for pursuing it³

Dean Billet listed the proposed additions to the departmental offerings as follows:

1. Economics (business economics)
2. Mathematics (computer science)
3. History (historic preservation)



Chemistry student, 1980s

4. Political Science (public affairs)
5. English (journalism, art criticism, technical writing, etc.)⁴

The dean added that “these departmental changes are proposed to meet the needs and interests of students—different from those concerned with the traditional pure liberal arts program—in a pluralistic curriculum which Goucher is able to offer within the resources we have.”⁵

In a continuation of the College Assembly’s consideration of new career-oriented courses, on March 12 Dean Billet made the following points:

1. In economics, the business economics course enabled one 1974 senior to take a position with a New York bank, and another to take one with the Comptroller of the Currency, both at high starting salaries. Six other majors have entered reputable law, graduate, and business schools. Similar courses are offered at Bryn Mawr and Swarthmore.
2. In the proposed computer science program, eight courses in mathematics will be required—nine are currently required in the mathematics major—plus three courses in computer science.
3. In visual arts, proposed courses include work in art conservation and ceramics.
4. The proposed addition of work in scientific or technical writing would be added to the student’s full major in the discipline of her choice.
5. Internships in history and political science (already in use) and proposed work in public affairs offer students experience which may mean the difference between employment and unemployment in the job market.⁶

The point of these observations was to allay fears that Goucher was renouncing the liberal arts in favor of preparation for careers exclusively.⁷ Many faculty members had expressed concern about this possibility, particularly those whose departments were experiencing serious declines in course enrollments and were therefore candidates for staff reductions or even program elimination. Dean Billet, the principal architect of the new curricular emphasis reflected in these programs, was therefore at pains to make clear his intention to permit new opportunities for career preparation to develop within the curriculum without eliminating the basic liberal arts orientation that had always characterized Goucher’s course of studies.

In the summer of 1976 an Academic Planning Committee consisting of three faculty members was formed to consider and design certain new undergraduate and graduate programs. The College had already introduced such new programs as dance, performing arts, and computer science, but it was unlikely that these changes alone would be enough to increase enrollment. The committee’s view was that pre-professional and professional offerings could be developed without subverting the basic liberal arts mission of the College. Two new programs were soon in

*The Academic
Planning Committee*

draft stage: management administration and a graduate program in arts therapies.⁸

The Academic Planning Committee, which in 1980 consisted of five faculty members elected by the Faculty, four faculty members appointed by the dean, and the directors of admissions and career development, issued a report on May 2.⁹ The committee had been charged with determining principles to govern the creation of new programs, recommending criteria for discontinuing instructional programs, and recommending unifying themes that should run through the new academic programs of the College. Their report accepted provisionally Dean Billet's recommendation to move ahead in developing new programs in management, communication, and computer science. It also supported an increase in the number of hours taught by faculty members and suggested a procedure for determining teaching positions most appropriate for termination. The Executive Committee accepted the report on June 2 and congratulated the faculty for its positive recommendations.

Although some women's colleges were reporting enrollment increases, total enrollment at women's colleges was continuing its long decline, and Goucher's enrollment reflected this decline. Applications to the College were down approximately 20 percent since 1977, the attrition rate of full-paying students exceeded 20 percent in each of the two previous years and was rising, and the size of the college-age cohort in the geographical areas of interest to Goucher could be expected to decrease by 27 percent in the coming years.¹⁰ The sophistication and quality of Goucher's admissions and recruitment endeavors had for some years been ahead of the competition,¹¹ but evidence suggested that the admissions office was reaching the limit of what could be accomplished by effort and cleverness. In the absence of significant staffing changes in faculty and administration, as well as other economies, the



Students reading a graph, 1980s

College's budget would include a deficit beginning in 1980–81. The deficit would be over \$1,000,000 per year by 1984–85, and the expendable endowment would be depleted by 1986. In the words of the Academic Planning Committee's report:

The Committee, in reviewing the available information, accepts the validity of the forecast of expendable endowment depletion by 1986. In fact, it apprehends that, if the forecast errs, it errs on the optimistic side, because it fails to account for a number of factors, all probably negative: the impact of the decreasing size on matriculation and retention rates because of student reaction to small size, the impact of the continuing decrease in the fraction of women choosing women's colleges, the impact of increasing fuel costs in the competition between "heating-bill" colleges and "warm-winter" colleges, and the impact of decreasing appreciation for the concept of liberal arts with passing time and changing clientele. Hence, it seems likely that, in the absence of appreciable change, the expendable endowment could be depleted as early as 1984–85.

On the basis of statements by members of the Board of Trustees and by the President, the date of the expendable endowment's depletion can be taken as the approximate termination date of College operations.

It is the apprehension of the Committee that the College is fighting, in the months ahead, for its very existence, and that the moment of truth may be as little as four years away.¹²

The committee then went on to discuss some fundamental rules of strategy for survival, for example, "if faculty members talk and act as if continued vitality of the College is assured, then assurance of continued vitality will be enhanced." The committee went on to rule out certain options that, however attractive in the longer run, might be detrimental to short-term cash-flow, namely, a curricular overhaul, a switch to coeducation, or program cuts that gave the appearance of curricular shrinkage rather than curricular improvement. According to the report, every position, faculty and administrative, should be examined on its merits. If cuts had to occur, persons involved should be given the opportunity to retrain for open positions wherever possible, in consultation with departments involved. Persons who must seek new positions should receive maximum College support in that effort.

Since, in the committee's view, much student dissatisfaction leading to withdrawal apparently did not stem from the academic area, every effort should be made to improve student satisfaction with the College; to this end, the committee made suggestions for improving freshman advising and involving faculty more directly in matters of career development.¹³

The committee further recommended continuing an aggressive building program, costs of which should be defrayed from specialized resources and not at the expense of the academic program. Building, including renovation, said the committee, "conveys a message of vigor," enhances student pride in the College, and impresses visitors favorably.¹⁴ The committee also favored conducting an aggressive investment program: "There seems to be little point in being cleverly leveraged for the late 1980s if the College perishes in 1984."¹⁵

Returning to the matter of principles that should shape the academic program, the committee advocated adherence to stated College goals, "with recognition that the form of the curriculum that best fulfills those

goals changes with time. The value of each course depends on its academic merit (the extent to which it serves to meet the goals) and on the number of students electing it. The impact of each teaching position depends on the overall value of the courses taught. The appropriate size of a department depends on the impact of the teaching positions in it. Therefore, if cuts become necessary, the Committee advocates that these be made on the basis of academic impact. Teaching positions carrying the least academic impact should be most vulnerable to cutting. A procedure should be followed which minimizes academic damage, both qualitatively and quantitatively."¹⁶

In light of the foregoing observations, the committee suggested a procedure for making cuts and additions in teaching positions when curricular changes must be made. In connection with the introduction of new programs, the committee outlined procedural steps for evaluating such programs, assuming that they must meet the following requirements:

1. [A new program] and the courses comprising it must have academic merit [measured in terms of] the extent to which it contributes to fulfilling Goucher's stated purpose and the number of students electing it
2. Necessary space and equipment must be available or economically procurable
3. [New programs] must be responsive to students' interests and to the perceived needs of society
4. They must be able to be staffed and taught efficiently¹⁷

On the basis of these criteria, the Academic Planning Committee approved the proposed changes Dean Billet described to the Executive Committee on June 2, 1980.

Finally, in Appendix C of its report, the committee proposed a four-step procedure for determining which teaching positions were most eligible for cutting. These steps involved, first, a determination of course value, based on its academic merit and its impact as both a major and a service course. A formula would generate a number representing course value. Next, the impact of the teaching position would be determined by using a formula taking into account course value (step 1), weekly contact hours for a given course, and the total number of contact hours expected of that position. Third, departmental efficiency would be determined on the basis of the weighted average of the teaching position impact (step 2) of each full-time faculty member in the department. (Reductions could be based on the principle that departments with the lowest efficiency value would be the most eligible for cutting.) Finally, after each cut was made in a given department, an attempt should be made to redistribute courses hypothetically to remaining faculty, to redistribute displaced students in deleted courses into other courses, and then the entire procedure should be repeated beginning with step 1.¹⁸

Understandably, some faculty members expressed grave reservations about the use of formulas, which, they felt, conveyed an impression of scientific precision not possible in matters involving very complex and necessarily judgmental decisions affecting professional careers. The Ac-

ademic Planning Committee, however, noted repeatedly that the use of the outlined procedural steps was intended to introduce into such judgmental decisions a measure of objectivity that might otherwise be given less weight than it deserved.

In a letter dated May 29, 1980, Professors Hedges, Cooperman, and Koppelman, respectively the chairmen of Faculties I, II, and III, and Professor Peirce, chairman *pro tempore* of an unofficial meeting of the faculty held on May 28, wrote to President Dorsey and Dean Billet to report that, at the unofficial meeting, "thirty full-time members of the Goucher teaching faculty unanimously subscribed to a motion calling for a moratorium on the actions implied by the May 20 report of the Committee on Academic Planning with respect to curricular changes and staff reduction. The group urged that no curricular decisions be made until or unless the Faculty accepts the report of the Committee at its first meeting in September 1980, and until or unless provision is made for the use of proper procedure for introducing new programs through departments, the Curriculum Committee, the Assembly, and the Faculty; and that no member of the staff be dismissed without formal consultation with his or her department and with the appropriate College committees."¹⁹

*Implementation of
the Major Proposals
of the Academic
Planning Committee*

The minutes of the trustee Executive Committee for June 2 state that with regard to the faculty letter requesting a moratorium, "after discussion of the problems such a delay would entail, Mr. DeVries moved that the College move ahead in acting on the Report of the Academic Planning Committee because of the importance of time in developing new programs." The motion was seconded and carried.²⁰

In a memorandum to the Faculty dated June 5, President Dorsey noted that "a group of faculty has requested that a moratorium be declared on the actions recommended by the report of the Academic Planning Committee. I have considered this plan carefully and am unable to accept it. As the report of the APC made clear, we must move rapidly if new programs are to have an impact on the admission and retention of students. Changes designed in 1980-81 cannot be implemented until 1981-82 and will have an effect on admissions only in 1983 at the earliest. A moratorium will delay this process for a year and will only protract an unpleasant and unavoidable task."²¹

Speaking to the Board of Trustees on June 14, Dean Billet, with advice from the Faculty's Academic Planning Committee, recommended curricular modifications, including the addition of some new programs and reductions in existing ones; this process would involve changes in faculty staffing. President Dorsey, he said, would make recommendations concerning faculty staff changes to the Executive Committee on June 23.

On that day Mr. Billet reviewed for the Executive Committee the material he had earlier given to the Academic Planning Committee. His projections indicated the serious impact of declining enrollment on the College's financial position. After questions and discussion Mr. DeVries proposed the following motion: "Resolved, that in order to address future serious financial implications of projected enrollment patterns, the resources of the College shall be reallocated to develop new pro-

grams. Therefore, programmatic modification is mandated and the report of the Academic Planning Committee (May 14, 1980) and the report of the Vice President for Academic Affairs [Dean Billet] (June 13, 1980) be and are accepted as modified to recommend the elimination of four full-time teaching positions for the academic year 1980–81, with other terminations to follow for the academic year 1981–82.”²² The motion was seconded by Mr. Pearlstone and carried unanimously.

At the meeting of the Board of Trustees on October 11, President Dorsey commented on the faculty terminations that had been decided during the summer. The four tenured faculty members affected had been given one year’s salary and benefits with no teaching duties assigned.²³ The College had also provided them with secretarial and job counseling services as well as coverage of expenses incurred in attending one national professional meeting.

One of the faculty members whose position had been terminated, visual arts Professor Gretel Chapman, raised the question of the validity of the trustees’ declaration that the College was, in June 1980, in a state of financial exigency. (Such a declaration was required if tenured faculty were to be terminated on grounds not involving their personal conduct, academic capabilities, or professional performance.) On June 13, 1981, the Board of Trustees unanimously approved the following resolution: “Resolved, that the Board of Trustees hereby votes its full approval of and confidence in the leadership of President Dorsey and Dean Billet and reasserts its determination that each faculty member be accorded fair and considerate treatment. And be it further resolved, that with full knowledge of the status of the College in June of 1980 and of all the events which have occurred since then, the Board hereby determines that its finding of financial exigency in June of 1980 was required; that finding is accordingly hereby reaffirmed.”²⁴

Professor Chapman appealed to the American Association of University Professors,²⁵ which sent an investigative committee to the College to inquire into the circumstances of her termination. The committee spent two days on the campus in April 1982, hearing testimony on both sides of the issue,²⁶ and on June 17, 1983, the AAUP voted to censure the College’s administration and Board of Trustees. The principal issue was whether or not the College had violated Professor Chapman’s academic freedom by terminating her position on the basis of a declaration of financial exigency that, according to the AAUP, failed to meet the conditions under which such action was justifiable. In essence, the question was whether the state of exigency was bona fide at the time the decision was taken to terminate tenured faculty or whether it was merely an anticipation of *future* financial exigency, in which case other less drastic steps might have been taken first in the hope of averting the impending crisis. Speaking to the Board of Trustees on June 18, President Dorsey said that while the College regretted the decision of the AAUP, it felt that it was right for Goucher to stand by the definitions and procedures approved by the Faculty and the board.²⁷

*New Degree
Requirements*

While some of the new emphases in the curriculum came about in response to the need to attract and retain more students, others resulted from a perceived need to solidify the academic program after the loosening of its structure in the early seventies. As a result, during the period from 1973 to 1984, the College Assembly approved a number of important changes in the requirements for Goucher's Bachelor of Arts degree.

On December 5, 1973, the College Assembly voted to eliminate the requirement that every student must perform, prior to graduation, an integrative exercise in her major field. A problem arose from the lack of consistency in the way various departments implemented the rule. By eliminating this college-wide regulation, the Assembly left to each department the responsibility for setting its own standards for satisfactory completion of the major.

In response to a perceived need to provide some common body of knowledge to all students, the College Assembly voted on April 16, 1975, to require all freshmen to complete a one-semester core course, whose content and structure would be determined by a committee representing each of the three faculties. The committee did its work, and on January 17, 1976, political science Professor Lawrence K. Munns, biology Professor Martin Berlinrood, and Miss Katharine ("Kathi") Newman, a student, reported to the Board of Trustees on the results. The purposes of the course, whose title was "Male/Female: Sense of a Classification," were threefold: (1) to provide an experience in general education, showing that various disciplines offer different windows for viewing one reality; (2) to provide freshmen with a shared intellectual experience; and (3) to provide faculty an opportunity to work together in a cross-disciplinary way in an effort to nurture intellectual growth and exploration and to overcome disciplinary isolation. Unfortunately, student reactions to the core course were not what had been hoped, and when student dissatisfaction reached a level that could not be overlooked, the Assembly voted on November 2, 1978, to discontinue the course.

As the core course was phased out, a new team-taught course was introduced: "Arts and Ideas." This course, which the Assembly approved on March 2, 1978, was to be an introductory offering in the humanities, required of all students by the end of the sophomore year in addition to the two-course distribution requirement in Faculty I. "Arts and Ideas" was designed to help students comprehend the forms and methods employed in literature, the visual arts, and the performing arts and in a general way to enable them to grasp the manner in which the arts participate in the history of ideas. The course would contain six units dealing with the formal, historical, expressive, and metaphoric aspects of works of art and their relation to objective reality. While the problems encountered by "Arts and Ideas" were less severe than those experienced by the core course, when it was evaluated two years after its introduction, the decision was made to eliminate the course.

When major curricular changes were introduced in 1970 as a result of the "Report of the Committee on the Future of the College," the language requirement was left intact, but on April 30, 1975, the College

Assembly voted that "all students will complete the intermediate level of one foreign language." This reduced the existing requirement, which stated that all students, except those beginning a new language at Goucher, must complete one course (in literature) beyond the intermediate level. Even with this weakening of the requirement, however, Goucher maintained a language requirement at a time when many other institutions abandoned it altogether.

On April 21, 1976, the Assembly specified that beginning with students entering in September 1977, the number of courses required for graduation would be thirty-four, or 136 semester hours, including at



Language student, 1980s

least two January-term courses. This changed when, on March 16, 1978, the Assembly voted to eliminate the January term and to substitute for it the requirement that all students complete one four-credit-bearing "experience" off-campus but under the aegis of Goucher. These experiences could take the form of internships, independent work, foreign study, or other activities of similar nature.

The most significant change in the requisites for earning the Goucher degree was probably the introduction, in 1981, of a set of distribution requirements that did much to overcome the rather loose curricular structure that had emerged from the recommendations of the Committee on the Future of the College in 1970. The first step leading to the new core curriculum, as Dean Billet called it, was the requirement, approved by the College Assembly on March 20, 1980, that "every candidate for the degree must demonstrate proficiency in English composition. This proficiency must be demonstrated by passing or exempting the first composition course in English and then by completing written work satisfactorily in any one of several courses in the English or other departments."²⁸ Each department could designate one or more courses in which writing occupied an important place; students might then elect one of these courses and announce their intention to submit their writing in that course in fulfillment of the English composition requirement. While such students would have their work in the course evaluated in the usual way for a grade, their writing would be given special, separate scrutiny and would be accepted (or not) as fulfilling the requirement in English composition. Of course, students might choose instead to elect English 105 for this purpose, but many preferred (and still prefer) to use a course in their major field to demonstrate their writing proficiency.

It is noteworthy that the English writing program now makes heavy use of word processors, which allow students to write drafts, call them up on the screen, and discuss them with a trained tutor or an instructor, inserting corrections immediately without the necessity of retyping sentences or paragraphs requiring no change. This facility encourages students to print multiple drafts and to continue the editing process until they are satisfied with the result. It is not surprising that this economy in time and energy tends to produce far better writing and more rapid learning than was possible before the advent of the word processor.



Ballet students, 1985

The complete overhaul of the distribution requirement was accomplished by May 7, 1981, when the College Assembly voted to replace the existing requirement (that all students take at least two courses in each faculty in which they did not major) with the following new set of requirements expressed in terms of goals to be achieved in various areas of the curriculum:

1. Abstract Reasoning (one designated course in Mathematics, Computer Science, or Logic). Goal: to develop the student's ability to reason abstractly and appreciate the elegance of abstract structures.
2. Fine and Performing Arts (one designated course in Art, Creative Arts, Dance, Music, or Theatre). Goal: to develop the student's sensory and critical awareness and therefore enjoyment of expressive form in a visual, kinesthetic and/or musical medium.
3. History (one designated course in History or Modern Languages [culture-civilization courses]). Goal: To introduce the student to the interrelationships between changing social, economic, political, intellectual, and artistic elements in the development of a culture during an historical period. The culture could be that of a single country (Hitler's Germany) or that of a larger region (Fascist Europe).
4. Literature (one designated course in English, Modern Languages, or World Literature). Goal: To develop the student's critical awareness and enjoyment of language, in its uniqueness, as an expressive medium for art.
5. Natural Sciences (one designated course in Biology, Chemistry, Physics, or Psychology). Goal: To give the student a basic understanding of the methods of scientific discovery and their relationships to the fundamental concepts of a discipline. The [Curriculum] Committee considers a laboratory component (possibly of only a few weeks' duration) essential.
6. Philosophy (excluding Logic, see #1: Abstract Reasoning); (one designated course in Philosophy, Religion, or Political Science). Goal: To introduce the student to major writers in the philosophical and religious traditions in order to stimulate the student's thinking about the permanent human issues of goodness, truth, beauty, and the sacred, and how we "know" anything about such matters.
7. Social Sciences (one designated course in Anthropology, Economics, Education, Political Science, Psychology, or Sociology). Goal: To introduce the student to various approaches and methods used by social scientists to analyze the social, economic, and political forces shaping human behavior.
8. Computer proficiency (one designated course in Computer Science or in another area in which the computer is extensively used in the given course). Goal: To give the student familiarity with the use of the language of the computer, an increasingly important tool both in business and the academy.²⁹

The requirements in foreign language, writing proficiency, and physical education remained unchanged. At the same meeting the College Assembly voted to establish a grade point average of 2.00 as a requirement for graduation, and on February 16, 1984, it voted to establish a minimum grade point average of 2.00 for courses required for satisfactory completion of the major.

Table 12 New Majors Added to Curriculum, 1975-85

New Major	Introduced	Remarks
Dance	1975-76	The first major of its kind in the Baltimore area
Pre-legal Studies	1975-76	
European Studies (other than English)	1975-76	The major involved the departments of Dramatic Arts, History, Music, Philosophy, and Modern Languages
Historic Preservation	1975-76	
Communications	1976-77	
Area Studies	1977-78	This title covers four distinct majors in French, Germanic, Hispanic, and Russian Area Studies.
Computer Science	1980-81	
Women's Studies	1981-82	
Management	1981-82	
Special Education	1985-86	
Latin American Studies	1985-86	

Source: Goucher College Archives.

Not surprisingly, the many changes in the degree requirements introduced during the Dorsey administration were accompanied by the introduction of a series of new majors. Most of these programs involved combinations of already existing courses augmented by new ones specifically designed for the new concentrations. Table 12 summarizes these additions to the curriculum.

New Major Programs

For many years the College had allowed students to elect a combination major,³⁰ that is, one in which two fields could be combined in a way that would permit a thematic or structural synthesis to be visible in the student's work. (This, at least, was the ideal, though its realization was not always fully achieved.) As students became more and more concerned about preparing for specific careers, however, increasing pressure developed to give them the opportunity to complete a double major, in other words, two distinct majors with no necessary link between them. Under such a system, a student could major in an area in which she planned to make a career, completing all the necessary requirements for that area of concentration, but she could also do the same in an area in which she felt a strong interest even though she foresaw no particular practical use to which she could put the second field. On February 20, 1974, the College Assembly voted to establish officially a double major, thereby allowing a student to show on her transcript that she had two strings to her bow.

Further Changes in the Undergraduate Curriculum

The new programs instituted in the mid-seventies had been intended to improve enrollments and retention of students; in addition, they generated increased foundation support. The new courses and programs that Dean Billet planned in 1974 and which were offered for the first time in 1975-76 had a gratifying response. In support of these efforts, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation granted the College \$150,000 for faculty development and additional help in the area of career development. On October 18, 1975, Dean Billet observed to the Board of Trustees that Goucher was seeking a balance between the

liberal arts and preparation for the professions, with courses taught by a liberal arts faculty. Among recent programs he cited the performing arts, historic preservation, public affairs, computer science, pre-legal studies, and a revitalized program in finance and economics which had generated a 50 percent increase in enrollments in the Economics Department. The \$150,000 Mellon grant would be used to provide special leaves for members of the faculty to engage in nonacademic professional experience in their fields of interest, and to develop closer relations between academic advising and career counseling in order to relate liberal arts courses and programs to the widening occupational opportunities available to women.

Other grants received by the College included a National Science Foundation grant to support implementation of a small network of interactive computer terminals tied to large scale computing equipment at the Johns Hopkins University.³¹ Once this equipment was in place, efforts were made to spread the use of the computer to a large number of departments. Thus, in January 1978, Professors Barton L. Houseman and Lewis A. Walker of the Chemistry Department, who had devoted much time and effort to propagating the use of the computer in the academic area, gave computer workshops for sixteen faculty members from a wide range of departments.³²

Goucher, along with five other colleges, received in 1978 a grant from the Carnegie Corporation to develop a Public Leadership Education Network (PLEN); Goucher's part in this enterprise involved the establishment of an internship program for students in women's colleges in Maryland to work with Maryland women public officials.³³

The year 1978 was a major one in terms of changes related to the curriculum. These included the decision by the College Assembly, on May 4, 1978, to modify the grading system by adding the grades A-, B+, B-, C+, C-, D+, and D- to the existing grades of A, B, C, D, and F, while defining them respectively as excellent, good, satisfactory, poor, and failing. Straight letter grades give the reader of a transcript no indication of whether a C represents a grade of 70, a grade of 79, or something in between. While less precise than numbers—which are often too precise for evaluating certain kinds of work—the plus and minus grades at least eliminate the uncertainty over whether a C student differs from a B student by as little as one percentage point or as many as nineteen points.

A new five-year program in public health, also introduced in 1978, led to the degree of Master of Public Health, jointly sponsored by Goucher College and the Johns Hopkins University School of Hygiene and Public Health. The College Assembly approved the program on November 30.

Perhaps the most important change made in 1979 was the decision, approved by the College Assembly on November 29, to substitute for the existing arrangement, in which all full courses carried four credits, a new variable credit system in which the normal number of credits for a semester course meeting three times a week would be three. This reduced the total number of hours required for the degree from 136 to 120, increased the total number of courses needed for the degree from thirty-four to a minimum of thirty-five to forty (depending on the major), permitted a student to elect up to ten full courses per year (as



Students in common room, 1980s

compared with the previous maximum of eight), and reduced the cost per course from \$507 to \$405. This change was urgently needed because, as a result of the 4-1-4 calendar adopted in the early seventies, Goucher's credit system was highly inflated and out of line with the national norm of 120 semester hours required for the Bachelor of Arts degree.

In 1980 Goucher instituted a new Writing Center in an effort to improve students' writing skills. Trained student tutors were available in the center several hours a day to help students with problems of grammar and organization. (The fact that *Weekly's* article dealing with the Writing Center [September 11, 1980] spelled the word "grammatical" with one "m" may suggest that the center's time had indeed come.)

In 1982 a new physical education program was developed, built around five goals: (1) wellness, (2) physical fitness, (3) environmental sensitivity/survival skills, (4) cooperation/team play/interpersonal relations, and (5) life skills. Students would be able to choose from among several offerings to meet these goals.³⁴

Finally, on May 3, 1984, the College Assembly voted to substitute for unscheduled final examinations a system of scheduled examinations in order to relieve pressures on the Honor Code.

While so much attention was being focused on the undergraduate curriculum, the graduate level was not neglected. In 1974 the only graduate program at the College was the one leading to the Master of Education degree. On September 9, 1974, on President Dorsey's recommendation, the Executive Committee approved a moratorium on the Graduate Program in Education, which operated at a financial loss, and the College decided to recruit no further enrollees beginning in September 1975. Three years later, on March 16, 1977, the College Assembly voted to approve a Master's degree program in Dance/Movement

Graduate Programs

Therapy, to be offered jointly by the Departments of Psychology and Performing Arts; this two-year program, with stringent entrance requirements, would consist of three semesters of courses plus a one-semester internship and independent project. The program, beginning in September 1978, would accept fifteen students per year and would be the only offering of its kind in the Baltimore area. The Board of Trustees approved the proposal on June 18, 1977, and in September 1978, under the direction of Professor Arlynn Stark, the Master's program in Dance/Movement Therapy began with fourteen enrolled students.³⁵

On November 29, 1979, the College Assembly voted to approve a Master of Arts Program in Art Therapy, paralleling the existing program in Dance/Movement Therapy, and the State Board for Higher Education's Program Committee endorsed the new program on March 3, 1980. Directed by Professor Christine W. Wang, the program began on schedule in September 1980, but on December 17, 1984, the Executive Committee voted to suspend it at the end of the 1985-86 academic year, when currently enrolled students would have completed their course of study. The program had had a consistently small enrollment and had operated at a deficit since its inception. The demand for the degree was not great, and there was a competing program at George Washington University. Furthermore, the offering did not have the kind of support enjoyed by the program in Dance/Movement Therapy.

*Programs for Part-
Time, Special, and
Summer Students*

The College appointed Professor of French Wolfgang E. Thormann acting director of the Summer Session for 1974. Forty-nine courses, carrying undergraduate credit were to be offered in two sessions, all taught by Goucher faculty. In fact, 301 students registered in twenty-seven courses during the summer session, and the College cleared \$2,000.³⁶ The second year of the summer school, arranged by Dean Billet, was also a success and showed growth in enrollment.

The College Assembly approved, on May 5, 1975, a new kind of program in which the College would award a second baccalaureate degree to a student who held a Bachelor's degree from an accredited institution other than Goucher, provided that (1) the student met all College requirements, (2) the courses accepted for the degree from the first institution were appropriate to the Goucher degree in both content and quality, (3) the student met the requirements for the major as defined by the department of the major and was recommended for graduation by the major department, and (4) the student completed at Goucher a minimum of eight courses (thirty-two semester hours) exclusive of January term offerings unless a January course was required as part of the major.

For the fall of 1977 Fontaine Belford, director of the Goucher Center for Educational Resources, prepared with her staff a wide range of offerings for the fall. The courses, which were open to all adults and held largely on the Goucher campus—days, nights, and weekends—fell into ten categories: Continuum, designed to help adults gear up for college work; five Goucher Seminars covering topics of current interest; Forum, offering courses in Christian-Jewish relations; Goucher II, offering many college-level liberal arts courses; a Business Practicum and a Volunteer Practicum.³⁷

On February 17, 1979, the center reported a first semester enrollment of 505 registrants (as compared with 408 the year before), and the Women's Management Development Program, operating under the center and designed to prepare women for managerial positions, had finished the training period for the twenty-four women involved; they would begin internships in a week.³⁸ The center was also at work with the State Department of Education on a program for gifted and talented high-school students in the arts. Four groups of two hundred teenagers would be on campus for two-week periods during the summer of 1979.³⁹ In October the Goucher Center reported an enrollment of 748 participants—the largest number to date.⁴⁰

In September 1980 the new Goucher II program for older women wishing to begin or return to college made a good start. After two years of special classes, these women would have earned twenty-seven credits and would be eligible for sophomore or junior standing, depending on prior college work. The program, which had hoped to open with twenty students, actually began with forty.⁴¹

In October 1984 the Goucher Center for Continuing Studies (the new name of the Goucher Center for Educational Resources) published its first newsletter, in which it reported that the fall semester had begun with a strong class in the Post-Baccalaureate Premedical Program and an equally strong Goucher II class.⁴²

Given the range of changes in the academic program at all levels during the first twelve years of the Dorsey administration, it is safe to suppose that there will be many more—though they must await the report of the next historian of the College. All the same, while future curricular innovations are unpredictable, one can at least indulge in the instructive comparison of the present with the past. We have already encountered examples of history repeating itself in various aspects of Goucher's evolution, and the curriculum is no exception. Despite the major curricular restructuring that took place in 1934, 1958, 1970, and the early 1980s, the end product in 1985 bears an almost uncanny resemblance, *mutatis mutandis*, to the academic program with which the College opened in 1888. This is not to say that Dean Van Meter would have encountered no surprises had he been able to foresee the contents of the 1985 Goucher catalog; biocomputing would have been only one of a number of programs of study entirely unfamiliar to him. But beneath such recent innovations, an analysis of the fundamental areas of study and the attendant mechanisms designed to insure their orderly assimilation would reveal far less change than one might expect in the course of almost one hundred years. For example, the fact that there are almost twice as many departments of instruction in 1985 as there were in 1888 can be explained in part by the fact that many of the early departments were really composed of clusters of related subjects, such as natural sciences, which included biology, chemistry, and physics. This was a normal administrative procedure given the number of faculty and the size of the student body at that time. But when we look beneath the umbrella designations of the nineteenth-century departments, we find that the only subject taught at the College when it opened that is not still part of the curriculum today is ancient languages, which, as we have seen, disappeared from the Goucher curriculum in 1976 (though students are still afforded the opportunity to pursue studies in

classics through the program of interinstitutional cooperation with neighboring colleges and universities). What is perhaps more surprising is that the only major programs in the current catalogue that cannot be traced back directly to one or more progenitors in the curriculum of 1888 are education (which became a major in 1917) and management (which became a major in 1981).

The structural framework designed to provide an orderly and educationally effective presentation of the fundamental disciplines has also come full circle in 1985. Degree requirements have been reduced from a high of 136 semester hours for graduation to 120, the number required in 1888. Variable credit, the two-semester calendar with a normal load of five courses per semester, and a strong set of degree requirements—all characteristics of the 1888 curriculum—have been reintroduced into the College's academic program. While this return to the basic structure of 1888 may suggest that "the more it changes, the more it's the same thing," it may also indicate that despite much experimentation over the years, in the long run Goucher maintains an unswerving—though largely unconscious—allegiance to its motto: "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good."⁴³

T W E N T Y



The End of the First Hundred Years (1980 - 1985)

T

hroughout 1980 and 1981 Mrs. Janet Jeffrey Harris, '30, who had recently completed her term as chairman of the Board and was now general chairman of the \$14,000,000 capital campaign, reported to the Board of Trustees on progress achieved. By February 9, 1980, over \$2 million had been pledged, and Goucher's capital grant request for \$1,250,000 had been introduced in the General Assembly; by June 14 the figure had reached \$4,770,300 from ninety-two sources; by October 11 the total was \$7,600,000. At that point corporations had pledged \$700,000 (compared with \$435,000 the year before), and Mr. Leslie B. Disharoon, vice chairman of the Board of Trustees, expressed the optimistic view that corporate gifts would double before the end of the campaign.

Pledges passed \$9 million on February 7, 1981, \$11.5 million on June 13, and \$13 million on October 10. On November 9 Patricia Purcell, vice president for development, informed the Executive Committee that a Capital-by-Phone campaign had been underway for five weeks; trained students had been making evening calls to alumnae not previously contacted. So far, \$261,000 had been pledged by 892 of these alumnae, of which approximately 20 percent had never given to the College before.

Finally, on January 9, 1982, Mrs. Harris was able to inform the Board that the campaign had exceeded its goal and stood at \$14,245,087 with still more to come, since the campaign would not close until the end of February. The successful outcome would be held in confidence until then.¹

*The Campaign for
Women of Promise*

Enrollments

The successful completion of the campaign for Women of Promise came at an opportune time, since the number of young women graduating from high school was on the wane. Indeed, that perennial weed in Goucher's garden of troubles, diminished enrollments, continued to blossom in the eighties and will probably not decay until about 1996. Demographic in origin, the falling enrollment pattern affects all institutions of higher education, and a reversal of the trend will not occur until more students graduate from high school in the first decade of the next century. We saw in chapter 19 Dean Billet's grim projections in 1980 that indicated the need to develop a new, more attractive curriculum was indeed urgent. President Dorsey pointed out to the Executive Committee on October 19, 1981, that because the College had missed its enrollment targets for two years in a row, the freshmen and sophomore classes were small. Since the small classes would remain small until they graduated, the College found itself in a critical situation for the current and immediately following years.

Dr. Dorsey's assessment was confirmed one year later when, although the number of entering freshmen rose from 215 in September 1981 to 253 in September 1982, there were eight fewer entering transfer students. This, combined with the graduation of a large senior class, caused the total FTE enrollment in the College to decline to 919, down from 946 the year before.²

The September FTE enrollment fell even further—to 901—in 1983. Although 278 new freshmen and transfer students entered in 1983 (compared with 287 in 1982), the reason for the drop was an increase in students who, though expected, failed to enroll in September, a higher attrition rate for returning sophomores, and a rise in the number of students dropped from the College for academic reasons.³

A more serious enrollment decline occurred in 1984, when 181 freshmen entered the College, as compared with 247 in the fall of 1983. Both applications and acceptances were substantially behind corresponding figures for several preceding years, an experience shared by many other medium-sized women's colleges. As Dr. Dorsey noted, this development was "unfortunate, but not unforeseen." It represented, in fact, a trend continued in 1985 and likely to continue for the next ten years.

Student Financial Aid

One effect of economic policies during the administration of President Ronald Reagan has been a decline in federal subsidies to colleges and universities, particularly in financial aid to students. In its *Report to the Governor's Commission on Excellence in Higher Education* (March 7, 1986), the Maryland Independent College and University Association (MICUA), representing twenty-four independent colleges and universities (including Goucher) and thirteen state-aided institutions, listed several "barriers to sustaining and enhancing excellence." One of the "most significant barriers" cited was "the continuing erosion of student financial aid, produced by diminishing federal dollars and by static

Table 13 Schedule of State and Federal Support, 1982–85

	1982–83	1983–84	1984–85
Pell	\$ 163,569	\$ 158,852	\$ 154,119
SEOG	75,806	75,879	79,802
National Direct Student Loan	101,001	99,239	77,767
College Work Study	143,945	153,469	153,469
Federal grants	12,928	75,879	79,802
Total Federal	497,247	533,186	473,867
State Scholarships	99,290	128,852	159,305
State Subsidy	501,588	538,866	537,055
Total State	600,878	667,718	696,360
Grand Total	1,098,125	1,200,904	1,170,027

Source: Minutes of the College Assembly, April 23, 1985.

funding by the State for scholarships.” The *Report* noted that over the period 1982–1985,

the share of student aid resources at independent colleges and universities from *Federal* sources has dropped from approximately 62 percent to 45 percent, and the share of student aid resources at independent colleges and universities from *State* sources has remained static at about 4 percent.

Over the same period, however, the share of student aid contributed by the colleges and universities and from private sources has increased substantially, from 34% to 51%. Nevertheless, the relatively high tuitions of the independent institutions—coupled with the declining availability of State/Federal aid—has already affected their financial accessibility for many students.⁴

At Goucher, because of an increase in federal grants in 1983–84 over the previous and following years and a rise in state scholarships and the state subsidy, the total of federal and state support from 1982 to 1985 has remained relatively stable, as shown in table 13.

When President Dorsey reported to the Executive Committee on October 19, 1981, that she had recently spent two days with the American Council on Education and could only conclude that “the economic outlook for educational institutions for the immediate future is not reassuring,” it became clear that the College should make a concerted effort to plan for the future. A group of trustees and administrators met in the fall of 1982 to consider the issues facing Goucher in the eighties and to determine how to maintain the momentum gained through the successful capital campaign. Subsequently, several task forces were appointed to study particular areas of concern.⁵

Dr. Jacqueline Mattfeld, '48, chairman of the Task Force on Academic Programs, reported that her group recommended designating a number of academic programs for special development because of their high prestige and/or competitive advantage. Goucher, she said, could be competitive in biology, chemistry, mathematics, and computer science.

Mr. George L. Bunting, Jr., chairman of the Social/Athletic Task Force, suggested that top priority be given to creating a comfortable

The Strategic Plan

social space for informal student gatherings, with food available at all times. Second priority would be to increase physical education space, but with a new physical education director and a new program just installed, it was too soon to define precise needs.

Mr. Edmund F. Haile, chairman of the Buildings and Grounds Committee, discussed the importance of improving another kind of space, the residence facilities, then twenty-five years old. He considered the estimated cost of \$1.25 million reflected in the capital campaign a low figure, but he noted that the renovation could be carried out in stages.

Mr. J. Richard Thomas, chairman of the Admissions Task Force, said that the College now needed to develop new markets, especially in the South and Southeast. Ms. Patricia Goldman, '64, speaking for the Programming Task Force, extended Mr. Thomas's suggestion by recommending the development of increased national recognition through professional marketing to support both recruitment and fund-raising.

President Dorsey pointed out that these five proposals were all based on three assumptions, namely, that Goucher would *not* develop large alternative degree programs, reduce costs below those of competitors to increase market share, or become coeducational. The Board then approved the three assumptions and the five task force proposals.


The Board met again on November 30 and accepted a schedule for implementing the strategic plan. First, it authorized an expenditure of \$100,000 in 1983-84 for academic program development. Then it authorized an expenditure of \$30,000 for the remainder of 1982-83 and \$75,000 in 1983-84 to obtain outside professional assistance in making the College more attractive to prospective students. For the improvement of physical facilities, the Board authorized the following expenditures in the summer of 1983, the first three of which were part of a request for state capital funding: library renovation, \$487,000; completion of the Hofferger Science Building, \$325,000; social space, \$1,483,000, a priority item; and for continuing maintenance work on the campus in general, \$120,000. Several other items were temporarily deferred.⁶

The 1980 Strike

In April 1980 Local 1231, representing Goucher's service and maintenance personnel, called a strike involving issues of compensation and a prescription drug plan. The strike enlisted the support of some students and faculty, who joined the workers in picketing the entrances to the campus.⁷ The College had been negotiating with the union since December 1979, and Vice President Richard R. Palmer outlined the College's final offer in a letter dated April 23, 1980. In a second letter dated April 25, Mr. Palmer notified the faculty, staff, and students that the College considered the strike illegal because Laborers' Union 1231 had failed to notify the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service of its plans thirty days prior to the actual strike. The College had filed an unfair labor practice charge with the National Labor Relations Board, which was investigating. To meet the union's salary demands would cost the College a total of \$109,000. In response to this situation, the Faculty voted to constitute an advisory committee, a facilitating group whose responsibilities were still to be defined, to help deal with problems involved in the strike.

Dr. Dorsey told the Faculty on May 8 that the College was waiting to hear from the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.⁸ The Advisory Committee created by the Faculty a week earlier reported that only the National Labor Relations Board could rule officially on the legality or illegality of the strike, which was still an unresolved question. If the strike was pronounced to be legal, the strikers would retain their status as employees, but they could be replaced by bona fide permanent employees. Striking employees would not be entitled to reinstatement in that case; they would, however, be entitled to be recalled when openings occurred, if their representative so requested unconditionally.

President Dorsey noted that, to date, the positions of two telephone operators, one custodian, one post office employee, one carpenter, and one groundsman had been filled by replacements. The College was willing to put the replaced employees on a preferential hiring list and had resorted to permanent replacements only because no temporary replacements could be found.



Goucher College, 1985

By June 14 the union employees were back at work, though no agreement had been reached. The two sides were still meeting with a federal mediator. The College had sent a letter to union employees on June 6 stating that Goucher's last offer would be put into effect as of May 31. The last offer included a wage increase of 30 cents an hour, back pay based on 50 percent of 30 cents an hour from January 1, and a guarantee that employees who had been replaced would be put on a preferred hiring list; they would be offered positions for which they were qualified, without loss of seniority or benefits, as soon as those positions became available.⁹ The strike was finally settled and a new contract signed in July 1980.¹⁰

*Gifts and
Construction*

Much of the renovation and construction envisaged by the College's strategic plan was made possible or greatly facilitated by a series of generous gifts that came to the College in the period 1980–85; for that reason, the two subjects are here treated together.

One of the first priorities in the late seventies in the area of campus improvements was the overdue renovation of both the Hoffberger Science Building and Van Meter Hall. On June 25, 1979, the Executive Committee appointed the firm of Richter Cornbrooks Matthai Hopkins, Inc., as architect for both sets of renovations, and on September 10 Mr. Haile, chairman of the trustee Buildings and Grounds Committee, presented to the Executive Committee architectural drawings for the proposed additions. Estimated costs were \$1.5 million for construction and approximately \$1 million for renovations in Hoffberger. Mr. Haile noted that, given a projected inflation factor of 13 percent per year in construction costs, any delay would add to the price. Goucher had applied to the General Assembly for matching funds, which were available for renovation expenses. Informing the full Board of Trustees about these plans on September 29, Mr. Haile noted that the total time involved would be eighteen months and the total projected cost about \$4,200,000.

On August 11, 1980, the Executive Committee accepted the recommendation of the Finance Committee that the addition to the Hoffberger building begin as soon as possible, and on October 11 the contract for the new wing was awarded for a little less than \$2 million. The groundbreaking ceremonies took place on September 12, 1981. A year later, on October 20, the new Hoffberger wing, named for Gairdner B. Moment, professor emeritus of biological sciences (1932–79), was dedicated.

Two other pieces of good news soon followed: the Alumnae Fund contributed \$607,000 to the College in 1980–81, the largest annual gift in the history of the College; and a new lectureship, recently endowed by Jane and Robert Meyerhoff, brought John Kenneth Galbraith to the campus in March 1982 as the first speaker.¹¹

Mr. Haile reported to the Board of Trustees on June 12, 1982, that the extensive work on the Hoffberger Science Building was almost finished and that Van Meter Hall had been completely vacated so that major renovations could begin. He expected that the faculty members would be able to move back into their offices by mid-August. (His

prediction proved to be correct, though what could be seen of Van Meter Hall from the outside on August 1 raised a number of skeptical eyebrows on the faces of denizens of the building.)

Other items of construction and renovation were made possible by gifts and bequests received in late 1982. The College received a gift of \$1 million from the Jack H. Pearlstone, Jr., Charitable Trust for a new student center on campus. Mr. Pearlstone, a trustee until his death in 1982, had been very interested in student life on campus and was much involved in plans for its enhancement. The gift in his memory made possible the student center whose absence had long been one of the real weaknesses in campus social life. The Executive Committee voted to create the Jack Pearlstone Student Center with the intention of committing such additional funds to the project as would be necessary "to achieve the centralization of the post office, bookstore, and snack bar functions at the same location."¹²

Then, also in late 1982, Cora Owlett Latzer, '15 bequeathed to Goucher \$25,000 for refurbishment or extension of the student Snack Bar, which she and her husband had earlier given to the College.¹³ Later, when the Snack Bar was moved to the new Pearlstone Student Center, the space in the College Center it previously occupied was converted into the Latzer Room, a multi-purpose area that could be used as a dining room, reception room, or meeting room for groups of various sizes—a very welcome addition that took some of the strain off the heavily over-booked Alumnae House.

Another enhancement of the campus scene, the renovated Rosenberg Gallery, located in the lobby of Kraushaar Auditorium and named for Ruth Blaustein Rosenberg, '21, was dedicated in November 1982.

In early 1983 the Maryland State Legislature passed a Goucher bond bill. The state grant of \$1,003,500, when matched, would be used to complete renovations in Hoffberger, undertake renovations in the library for audio-visual and communications facilities, and build an additional dance studio with supporting offices.¹⁴

A large and enthusiastic group attended the dedication of the Jack Pearlstone Student Center on April 12, 1984, and President Dorsey commented to the Board of Trustees on October 20 that the students were very pleased with the center and with the renovations in Stimson Hall. The College had undertaken a much-needed refurbishing of Stimson Hall during the summer of 1984, with a number of other projects. By September the work in Stimson Hall was nearly complete, the last laboratory to be renovated in Hoffberger was finished, a new language laboratory with state-of-the-art equipment was in operation in Van Meter Hall, and changes were underway in the arrangement of offices in the College Center as a result of the removal of various departments to the Pearlstone Student Center. The next phase of renovations would include the library, additional work in Hoffberger, and the dance studio.¹⁵

When the Board of Trustees met for the first time in the new Latzer Room on October 20, 1984, Mr. Haile reported that the Pearlstone Center had been completed at a cost of \$1,781,000. In the College Center, the Printing Office (the former Post Office), the Latzer Room (the former Snack Bar), and the Registrar's Office (the former Commuting Students' Lounge) had all been finished during the summer, and in the

summer of 1985 the College would undertake the refurbishment of Heubeck Hall, the renovation of part of the library, and the reconstruction of the patio area behind the Pearlstone Student Center.¹⁶

For many years the College had regularly received annual contributions from the Summerfield Baldwin Foundation. (Mr. Baldwin, one of the College's founders, had been an early chairman of the Board of Trustees.) When Baldwin House in Mary Fisher Hall was taken over by the Post Office and Bookstore, the College decided to continue the Baldwin name by using it for the refurbished portion of the library that would house the College archives. Subsequently, the Baldwin Foundation gave the College \$25,000 to restore the patio area of the Pearlstone Center, which was completed in the second semester of 1984 and, by stipulation of the Foundation, named in honor of Mr. Leslie Disharoon, retiring chairman of the Board of Trustees. Meanwhile, once the new dance studio was ready, the former faculty lounge in Van Meter Hall, then used by the dance program, would become a communications center, and space in the library would be used for an information and technology center.

The College announced in May 1985 that Alonzo G. and Virginia G. Decker had given Goucher a \$1 million gift to fund both an endowed faculty chair and the Alonzo G. and Virginia G. Decker Center for Information Technology, to be housed in the Julia Rogers Library. Renovations for the center were scheduled for completion by summer 1986.

There could be no better way to conclude this section on gifts and construction in the mid-eighties than with the news the Executive Committee heard on August 26, 1985: the Alumnae Fund had closed the 1984–85 year with gifts totaling \$1,131,593, with 49.88 percent of the alumnae participating—the largest Alumnae Fund contribution and the largest alumnae participation in the history of the College.

*Sale of the Twenty-six
Acres on Fairmount
Avenue*

When, on March 21, 1980, Mr. Haile presented four proposals for development of the twenty-six-acre tract on Fairmount Avenue which the College had been trying to sell for twenty years, the Executive Committee voted to pursue the proposal of Ralph DeChiaro Enterprises, Inc. On January 9, 1982, after another two years of negotiations, the Board of Trustees learned that the sale of the Towson Plaza property to Mr. DeChiaro had been completed, and that the sale of the twenty-six acres on Fairmount Avenue—not to Mr. DeChiaro but to Mr. Larry Rachuba in partnership with McCormick Properties—was to be signed on January 22. Finally, on April 12, “amid rejoicing and acclamation,” Mr. Russell R. Reno, Jr., College counsel, announced to the Executive Committee that the College had at last completed the sale of 26.1 acres of land on Fairmount Avenue on March 31, 1982, for \$3 million.

One useful side effect of the sale of the Fairmount Avenue tract was the addition of a new exit road from the College. Dulaney Valley Road had been widened yet again to handle the increased traffic that would be occasioned by the development of the former Goucher property, and the greater width made a left turn exit from the College's main entrance on to Dulaney Valley Road a hazardous undertaking. In exchange for the Goucher land used for widening the road, Mr. Rachuba agreed to build, at his expense, a connector road that would permit a departure from the

campus through his newly acquired property to a traffic light on Fairmount Avenue, thereby avoiding the necessity of turning left on Dulaney Valley Road itself.

*End of the First One
Hundred Years*

In March 1983 Vassily Aksyonov, one of the most celebrated Soviet writers in exile, accepted appointment as the Meyerhoff Visiting Professor in Russian and English for 1983–84. This was a major coup for the College since Mr. Aksyonov had declined similar invitations from a number of distinguished universities and would be at Goucher when several of his books first appeared in America in English translation.¹⁷ Good news was repeated a year later when Visiting Professor Aksyonov agreed to extend his stay on campus through 1984–85, thanks to another gift from Jane and Robert Meyerhoff.

*Faculty and
Administrative Gains
and Losses*

The campus was shocked and saddened by the death on August 28, 1984, after an extended illness, of the College's dean and vice president, Dr. James Billet. Speaking to the Board of Trustees on October 20 about Dr. Billet's decade (1974–84) at Goucher, President Dorsey cited his energy, imagination, and understanding of the academic world. "He was, most importantly, a thinker and a leader." He had refocused the Goucher academic program, reshaped the faculty, and restructured the College's academic support systems, and his vision of what Goucher should and could be was now largely in place.¹⁸

President Dorsey announced to the Executive Committee on September 10 that Dr. Martin Berlinrood, who had moved from his position as registrar to that of acting dean during the latter part of Dean Billet's illness, would continue in that role and that a search committee to select a new dean would begin its work shortly. The following April President Dorsey appointed Dr. Carol S. Pearson as Goucher's new dean and vice president.

On March 23, 1985, Dr. Dorsey reported sadly to the Board of Trustees the recent deaths of two outstanding members of the faculty, Brownlee Sands Corrin (professor of communications, earlier professor of political science, 1952–85), and Mary Taylor Hesky (lecturer in English, 1963–82).

In the early eighties students seemed to be anticipating the coming centennial year in 1985. As early as 1980 Trustee Ann Greif, reporting to the Executive Committee on behalf of the Student Life Committee, commented on a new interest among the undergraduates in old traditions at Goucher College.¹⁹ This interest took concrete form on April 25 when, at the request of the student members of House Council, President Dorsey cancelled classes beginning at noon to allow the entire campus to participate in a program called Get into Goucher. The purpose of the event was to celebrate the College and generate enthusiasm for it, while teaching members of the community something about Goucher's past. As the chapel bells pealed at noon on the first GIG Day (as it came to be called), students, faculty, and administrators swarmed into Kraushaar Auditorium, where five alumnae from five different decades spoke of their years at Goucher. The entire College community was then invited to a picnic on the president's lawn, followed by singing,

Student Life

games, movies, and a campus-wide party. The planners of the event hoped that GIG Day would become a new annual tradition—which, indeed, it has.

*From Promise to
Achievement: The
Celebration of the
Goucher Centennial*

The academic year 1984–85 provided the College an opportunity to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of its founding in 1885. The centennial year was marked by so many events that it is appropriate to conclude this history from July 1, 1930 to June 30, 1985—a period that began in the early years of the depression and has included so many reversals as well as triumphs—with an account of the festivities that enlivened the last of these fifty-five years.

*From the Planning
Stage through
September 1984*

Planning for the centennial celebration began in 1982, when Martha Arnold Nichols, '38, dean emeritus of students, agreed to serve as general chairman of the committee to plan the centennial.²⁰

Like most academic years, 1984–85 began with a college-wide picnic—but this was the first such picnic that saw the president rise majestically above the campus with the aid of a hot-air balloon. The occasion was, in fact, sufficiently extraordinary to inspire James H. Brady of the Baltimore *Evening Sun* to devote the first paragraphs of an article on Goucher to the following account of the event:

Womanhood was having a high on the Goucher campus Saturday [September 8, 1984]. To start off its new academic year—its full 100th year—the college had decreed a Centennial Picnic. To impart a touch of the essential Goucherian *Excelsior!* the college had scheduled its first-ever balloon ascensions. There on the lawn behind Mary Fisher Hall was Maryland's 350th anniversary gas bag, its trailing ropes lashed to several immobilized loyalist automobiles. There about the gondola, once the winds had finally died, stood a majority of the 1,250-member Goucher community, heads craned back and chanting, in the manner of Memorial Stadium: "Rho-da! Rho-da! Rhohhh-da!" There, gripping the sides of the passenger basket, knuckles gleaming whitely, up, up, several hundred feet up, went the smiling president of Towson's greatest institution for the ever-higher education of womankind.

Then Rhoda M. Dorsey, older and wiser by her first decade in office and her first flight with no cabin came down again. Other people, drawn by lot, followed. And then it was Sunday, and Monday, and classes, and Goucher had come back down to earth.

... At Saturday's picnic, onlookers cheered as the balloon bore Rhoda Dorsey aloft but a flippancy voice said, "Cut the ropes."²¹

At the picnic ABC-TV filmed Goucher students sending greetings to the nation, a spot broadcast on ABC's "Good Morning America" program on October 22, 1984.²²

Goucher's president may have returned to earth, but neither she nor the rest of the community lost the uplifting centennial spirit. The next event, also a normal feature of the opening of an academic year but this time with a difference, was the convocation held on September 12 in Kraushaar Auditorium. Present for the occasion, amid blue and gold banners and balloons and a choir of fifteen trombones, were not only President Dorsey, but both of Goucher's living former presidents, Otto F. Kraushaar and Marvin B. Perry, Jr., together with Maryland Gover-

nor Harry R. Hughes, whose mother was a Goucher alumna of the class of 1915.

*End of the First One
Hundred Years*

The academic year began on the day of the fall convocation and until March—it was on March 12, 1885, that the founding committee declared its work completed—the centennial program was appropriately and exclusively academic: it took the form of four symposia.

*The Four Centennial
Symposia*

The first symposium, whose topic was conflict resolution in international affairs, was led by George Ball, former undersecretary of state and United States ambassador to the United Nations, who spent October 15–17 at Goucher as speaker-in-residence.

The second symposium, on style in the arts, ran from November 12–14 and featured Ada Louise Huxtable, former architecture critic of the *New York Times*, Violette Verdy, internationally acclaimed former ballerina and current teaching associate at the New York City Ballet, and Luise Vosgerchian, professor of music at Harvard University. The program included a panel discussion on criticism in the arts, a public lecture by Ada Louise Huxtable: “The Search for a Skyscraper Style,” and a panel discussion on style in the arts of the twentieth century. Following the symposium, on November 16 and 19, the Dance, Music, and Theatre Departments presented a production of “L’Histoire d’un Soldat” by Igor Stravinsky.

The third symposium, devoted to women writers, was divided into two parts. Part one took place on March 5–7 and included a panel discussion with short story writer Grace Paley, literary critic Hortense Spillers, and poet June Jordan, as well as a public lecture by Maya Angelou, author, television producer, and singer. Part two brought to the campus award-winning novelist, short story writer, and poet Joyce Carol Oates for a four-day visit on March 18–21.

The fourth and last symposium focused on the theme of women in science and featured Vera Kistiakowsky, professor of physics and celebrated researcher in high energy particle physics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Professor Kistiakowsky was speaker-in-residence for three days on April 16–18.

In April 1985 the trustees decided to offer (in 1985 only) two centennial scholarships, the winners to pay, during each of their four years in college, the princely sum that constituted Goucher’s tuition when the College opened in 1888: one hundred dollars. In addition, twenty-eight semi-finalists were awarded one-year grants of \$2,500.²³

*The Momentum
Builds: February–
April 1985*

During the height of Louis Comfort Tiffany’s career as an artist in stained glass, the College commissioned from his studio a 10’ x 15’ tryptich window to stand on the western wall of Goucher Hall. The tryptich, which cost \$3,000 (of which \$1,000 was a gift of the classes of 1892 through 1903), honored Mary Cecelia Fisher Goucher (1850–1902). Principal Tiffany studio designer Frederick Wilson used the traditional allegorical figures of Faith, Hope, and Charity to represent the character of Mrs. Goucher. Dedicated with great ceremony in 1904, the Tiffany windows adorned old Goucher Hall for forty-five years, but when the College moved to Towson they were dismantled and packed

away in open crates. As the centennial approached, President Dorsey felt that it was both exciting and essential to restore the windows and install them on the Towson campus as a reminder of the central role of the Goucher family in the early years. With the help of the Art Department and the Development Office the task was accomplished, and the Goucher Tiffany windows were restored to their original splendor and installed as a permanent exhibit in the Rosenberg Gallery in time to be unveiled in a ceremony on March 3 which was attended by a large and enthusiastic audience including descendents of President and Mrs. Goucher.²⁴

Later the same day a flock of buses took the majority of those who had been present for the Tiffany window unveiling downtown for two more events: a walking tour of some of the old campus buildings, then a commemorative service in Lovely Lane Church followed by an open house and reception.

Less than a week later, on March 9, nearly five hundred participants departed at high speed from the Goucher campus to undertake an eight-mile run to the original campus at St. Paul and 24th Streets in Baltimore. In the words of centennial Chairman Martha Nichols, "physical education has always been an integral part of the curriculum at Goucher. Besides demonstrating the link between the two sites in the school's history, this was one of the things that many alumnae and students said they wanted as part of the celebration."²⁵ According to *Weekly* on March 29, 1985, almost all the runners finished, and everyone had a good time. Four faculty members as well as many students participated in the race, and an alumna from New York was the second finisher.

On March 21 Goucher students—with some assistance from their elders—recreated the formal teas that were once a part of campus life. In the modern setting of the Pearlstone Cafe, elegantly gowned and white-gloved young ladies poured tea with almost perfectly steady hands, quite as though they had been doing so for years. Nearby, several Goucher faculty members clad in magnificent Victorian costumes added further touches of nostalgia to Goucher's first and only centennial tea.

Needless to say, the celebrating of the centennial did not take place only on the Goucher campus. Between October 1984 and April 1985 regional events occurred in Chicago, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Dallas, various sites in Florida, Harrisburg, New York City, Washington, and Boston. "We've tried to tailor the activities to the particular interests, needs and preferences of the environment," said Martha Nichols. "In Los Angeles, friends and alumnae of the school will take a cruise on John Wayne's yacht with a Dixieland band and a crab cake buffet. In Chicago, there will be a symposium with outstanding television personalities. And in Dallas, there will be a fund-raising dinner to start a scholarship in honor of Judge Sarah T. Hughes, the Goucher alumna who swore in Lyndon Johnson as president."²⁶

All these varied activities, in Towson, Baltimore, and around the country, were part of the crescendo leading to the climax: the Gala Centennial Weekend held in Towson and Baltimore on May 10–12, 1985.

*The Gala Centennial
Weekend*

The Gala Centennial Weekend festivities began with a welcoming reception at Pennsylvania Station in Baltimore, where special Goucher centennial Amtrak trains brought some of the more than one thousand alumnae participants from Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago. At 6:00 p.m. on Friday, May 10, shuttle buses began ferrying guests from the campus and various hotels to the Baltimore Convention Center for a Toast to Goucher College, an elegant reception and dinner followed by the presentation of centennial alumnae awards and remarks by the Honorable William Donald Schaefer, mayor of Baltimore.

Saturday, May 11, proved to be a gorgeous day, perfect for the parade of classes which departed from the Pearlstone Center and arrived at Kraushaar Auditorium, led by Goucher's founder, John Franklin Goucher, and his wife, Mary Fisher Goucher (who on other occasions appear disguised as Dr. James L. A. Webb, professor of chemistry, and Louisa Whildin Buchner, '26). Senior alumnae were transported by antique cars provided by the Chesapeake Region Antique Automobile Club of America. Many alumnae dressed as they had in their undergraduate days and carried appropriate class banners. In Kraushaar Auditorium President Dorsey's address on Goucher Today was followed by the Goucher centennial film and the presentation of Annual Giving class gifts. Luncheon followed in the Latzer Room and the College Center courtyard, except for the 25th and 50th reunion classes, who attended the president's reception and luncheon in the Alumnae House.

Following the luncheons, some guests boarded shuttle buses running between the campus and the Inner Harbor to enjoy the renaissance of the city of Baltimore, while the majority returned to the classroom for a Mini-Intellectual Fair that included a variety of presentations ranging from "Computer Literacy" to "Etymological Pursuits, or Some Linguistic Trivia." The evening festivities, appropriately titled "Saturday Night Live," featured receptions, dinners, five decade parties with music appropriate to each period, a concert offered by the Peabody Ragtime Ensemble, and "A Salute to Sousa," a ballet choreographed by Goucher ballet Artist-in-Residence Jean-Pierre Bonnefoux. The grand finale took the form of a centennial fireworks display that could be seen for miles. The weekend concluded on Sunday, May 12, with a return to the campus for a chapel service, brunch, and final farewells.

In her thanks to those who helped organize the Centennial Celebration, President Dorsey said:

It's been a wonderful year! From our opening picnic in September through convocation, academic symposia, regional celebrations, the run from new campus to old, and our grand Gala Weekend, there has been an overwhelming spirit of joy and love in the observance of Goucher's 100th birthday. The success of each of the more than 50 centennial events that took place during the past several months has brought credit to Goucher and to the people who worked so hard to make this celebration possible. No college could survive—and prosper—for 100 years without the very special commitment

and affection of its alumnae, students, faculty, staff, and friends. You are what makes Goucher such a grand institution. . . .

The Centennial Celebration may have ended, but the College had reached a new beginning. As President Dorsey observed at the Toast to Goucher College that opened the Gala Centennial Weekend, “Now it’s time to begin our second century.”

Afterword: The Transition to Coeducation

The beginning of Goucher's second century was less of an anticlimax than might have been anticipated. While this book was designed to encompass fifty-five years of Goucher College's history, concluding on June 30, 1985, an event of such exceptional importance occurred in 1986 that to exclude it would be to ignore one of the most salient turning points in the history of the College.

On January 25, 1986, President Dorsey sent to the Goucher community, alumnae, and friends *The President's Letter*, in which she announced the recommendation of a committee of the Board of Trustees that the College admit men to Goucher's undergraduate program.

Predictably, President Dorsey's announcement provoked a strong reaction, largely positive among faculty, administrators, and older alumnae, but largely (though by no means universally) negative on the part of current undergraduates and recent graduates. On campus the arguments for and against a coeducational Goucher were the subject of discussions, sometimes emotional, sometimes very thoughtful, in the Students' Organization, the College Assembly, the Faculty, and, of course, in the pages of the student newspaper, now called the *Quindecim* since it appears biweekly. As the time for the trustee decision approached, a student poll brought forth a negative vote, but the College Assembly (by a vote of 57 in favor, 28 opposed, and four abstentions) and the Faculty (by a corresponding vote of 39-12-3) recommended "an extension of Goucher's mission to include the education of men."¹

On May 10, 1986, amid a protest by nearly two hundred students, the Board voted to admit men to Goucher's undergraduate program, 30 members voting in favor, 7 against, and one member abstaining. Patricia Goldman, '64, chairman of the Board of Trustees, announced that male students would be actively recruited for the fall of 1987.² The reasons

underlying this decision are explained in the following account contributed by Julie Roy Jeffrey, professor of history.

The Historical Background

The admission of Goucher's first coeducational class in fall of 1987 marked the beginning of a new stage in the institution's ongoing life. By the time the first male students arrived on campus, most of the community greeted them enthusiastically, sensing that coeducation represented an exciting new opportunity for the College. Yet the Board of Trustees had reached the decision to admit men only with difficulty, and some parts of the community had responded to that decision negatively, even tearfully.

In the early seventies coeducation had twice been publicly debated on the campus (in 1970 and 1973) and rejected by the board. As a part of its planning efforts in 1982, the board had again rejected the option of a coeducational Goucher although the community at large had not known of its discussions. Yet five years later coeducation was a fact. What accounted for this shift in the board's position on the question of admitting men to the College?

Consequences of the 1982 Strategic Plan

In 1982 the board had undertaken, as noted earlier, a major planning effort to ensure the future of the College. Implementation of the strategic plan began at once. Efforts to improve the physical plant, athletic facilities, and social life proceeded. In the fall of 1983 a Wells Fargo running course was in place. In the spring of 1984 the new student center, Pearlstone, opened. By the summer a new language lab was complete. The renovation of dormitories and classroom space occurred on schedule. In selected areas, new faculty were also recruited in 1982–83 and 1983–84. Admissions efforts were expanded with more travel, more staff, more research, the use of a segmented search process, and better publications. With the retention of the firm of Ogilvy and Mather, efforts to make Goucher known outside the mid-Atlantic region became regularized.

Despite all these initiatives, success in attracting young women was not forthcoming. In 1983–84 there appeared to be little pay-off from the College's attempts to create a national market base. And that year was disastrous in terms of recruitment in the mid-Atlantic states. Ironically, the numbers were most disappointing in Maryland. The class entering in 1984 was substantially smaller (by almost seventy students) than the class that preceded it. The next few years would continue the disappointing recruitment pattern, and the students coming to Goucher appeared to be weaker in terms of their other college choices than had once been the case. The decline in the College's enrollment was exceeding the three percent "managed decline" the strategic plan had outlined as acceptable.

In September 1984 sixteen trustees gathered at a retreat site to review and to update the 1982 plan. It was now apparent that Goucher's toughest competitors were those Seven Sisters who had remained women's institutions. They were reaching down into Goucher's pool, and the College was suffering from their large classes. However, it was equally apparent that the coed schools in the mid-Atlantic region were also competing with Goucher for some potential students. In response to this situation, the trustees modified the 1982 plan, recommending increased admissions efforts, more funds, more admissions research. They also suggested convening a group of trustees to consider various options that might bring the necessary number of students to the College. In a departure from the recent past, they concluded that coeducation might need to be considered in the future as one of these options.

Study of the question of coeducation within the board and senior staff began almost immediately thereafter. In November 1984 the vice president for financial affairs prepared a report in which he suggested that if *any* of the basic characteristics of the College identified in the 1982 strategic plan were in question, then the entire plan was in question. The basic assumption of that plan had been that Goucher could attract enough students to allow it to survive as a small, quality liberal arts college for women. Poor admissions results and the general disinterest of young women in single sex institutions undermined that assumption. "There is reason to believe," he pointed out, "that better penetration of our current market base . . . may not be sufficient to meet the enrollment need."³ Although no one considered that the admission of men would prove to be a panacea for the enrollment problem, senior staff began to weigh the costs and benefits of coeducation.

In a board retreat in early 1985, a small group of trustees reached consensus that the College could manage downward only "so far." All alternatives had to be considered. Nor were the trustees and the senior staff the only ones worrying over Goucher's future by 1985. At the March board meeting that year, the president distributed a faculty resolution expressing concern that declining enrollments might mean cuts in program and staff. She also reported to the board that she had hosted three dinners with faculty to hear their ideas on making Goucher more attractive to prospective students. But by the end of that year, the news was still not good. At the May board meeting the administration reported that while applications had been up, acceptances stood at the level of the previous year.

When Patricia Goldman became the chair of the board in the fall of 1985, she asked a small group of trustees to take yet another look at the strategic plan of 1982. Background materials for the group, prepared by the senior staff, highlighted the pattern of enrollment that could lead to a total student body of 700 by 1989–90 with a student/faculty ratio of less than 7:1. Recent figures were discouraging: an unusually high freshman-sophomore attrition rate (almost 25 percent) and a dramatic decline in inquiries for 1986. Market research studies on Goucher students and those who had chosen to go elsewhere were also included in the trustee packet. While none of this material was entirely unfamiliar, it did highlight the serious situation in which the College found itself.

As part of the background material for the trustee task force meeting in October, the senior staff also prepared several documents: a consideration of the strengths and weaknesses of a single sex or a coeducational Goucher; two models for a new Goucher—a more focused single sex school vs. a "truly equal and novel coeducational institution." Despite the need to deliberate carefully and thoughtfully, the message was clear. The trustees did not have the luxury of study alone. The budget was not tight, but falling enrollments would eventually have an adverse impact on the College's strong financial position. Some critical decisions about the future would have to be made.

Discussions within the task force resulted in the elimination of the option of a college "more specifically centered on ideological feminism." There was no rush to embrace coeducation, however. The task force wished to study successful single sex institutions but also decided to "look carefully" at coeducation.

When the group met again in November, the trustees had been provided with a summary of societal factors that undermined the position of women's colleges, an analysis of arguments supporting coeducation, a consideration of the impact of coeducation on Goucher's mission, and materials from Washington and Lee, an institution that had recently undergone the process of coeducation. They also had the information on models of successful single

Making the Decision

sex colleges that they had requested. The schools which Goucher most resembled, however, had substantial opportunities for cross-registration with other institutions that provided them with a "heterosexual population"—an opportunity that Goucher did not have.

As a result of its studies, the trustee task force concluded that the board should open enrollment to men. Their recommendation was conveyed to the entire board for discussion at a specially called board meeting in January 1986. President Dorsey's detailed letter to the trustees chronicled the deliberations that had taken place, the alternatives considered and rejected (such as accepting substantial enrollment losses, abandoning the liberal arts curriculum, relying on continuing education to solve the enrollment problem), and the task force's conclusion that coeducation might be the "best way to prepare women for the next century."

At the board meeting in late January, trustees expressed mixed opinions about the task force's recommendation. At the meeting's end, they passed a resolution requesting that the College community provide the board with comments on the task force proposal. Debate about the merits and disadvantages of a coeducational Goucher would soon begin.

The administration was careful to inform the College community, alumnae, parents of students, friends of the College, donors, and prospective students that the trustees were considering the possibility of coeducation. In a letter sent in March, the president clarified the timetable: the board would make the final decision about coeducation at its May meeting.

The notice that the board was weighing coeducation mobilized some parts of the campus as few other issues had done. The dean of students met with students and found them initially "negative and emotionally charged." A group of trustees came to campus and met with seventy-five students. Some students hostile to the idea of changing the college's identity argued, without evidence, that declining enrollments were the result of faulty recruitment procedures. Buttons and teeshirts appeared with anti-coeducation slogans. A protest rally drew about 100 students while fifteen students picketed the Alumnae House when the trustees met there in May. Many students, however, seemed quietly to accept the possibility of a coeducational Goucher.

Other parts of the College community were more positive than the students. The faculty, already concerned about declining enrollments, expressed generally favorable reactions to the idea in the meetings held with them. There was some division of opinion, however; the student newspaper published the views of faculty who opposed the move as well as of those who favored it. Alumnae expressed their views on the telephone, in various meetings held around the country, and in writing. Mail ran about ten to one in favor of coeducation although alumnae opposed to coeducation were often prominent at regional gatherings.

Various campus groups began to study the question of a coeducational Goucher. The Maypole Committee, which had produced a vision statement for a single sex college, drafted a vision statement for a coeducational Goucher. An expanded Student Life Committee investigated the implications of coeducation for student life. A series of visitors from formerly single sex colleges came to Goucher to describe their schools' experiences with coeducation. To help with the College's deliberations, Special Assistant to the President Ethel Viti undertook a major study of four former women's colleges (Skidmore, Vassar, Manhattanville, Connecticut College) that had admitted men in the early seventies. Her report was ready in April and provided useful information on the process of coeducation, the impact on academic programs, athletics, admissions, and student life. She paid special attention to the status of women after coeducation, and her conclusions were generally positive. She observed that "Goucher College is well positioned to undertake a move to coeducation at this time." The advice for Goucher that

she heard as she visited the other colleges was that if Goucher decided to become a coeducational institution, "the College should do so without apologies, with no regrets, and with total commitment to a superior education for both men and women."

When the trustees met in early May, some attempted to delay the final vote until the fall. They failed. The vote (30 yes, 7 no, 1 abstention)⁴ showed that the majority of trustees were convinced that coeducation was a necessary step for the College's survival. After the vote was taken, the president left the Alumnae House to tell the students who were waiting to hear the decision. It was an emotional meeting; Goucher had made a momentous decision but one that the board clearly felt was essential for the successful future of the college.

Despite the opposition of many students to coeducation at Goucher, *Quindecim*, in an editorial published on May 14, 1986, under the title "The Challenge of Change," expressed its confidence in Goucher's future:

With the exception of the day of our founding in 1885, May 10, 1986, will be remembered by many of us as the most important day in the history of Goucher College. On May 10, a semester marked by debate, protest, and emotion culminated in a result that changes Goucher's philosophy and future.

While the next ten years of transition will present a new challenge, as the incoming editors of the *Quindecim*, we believe that Goucher will meet this challenge and succeed as we have throughout the past 100 years.

In the 1880's, our founders faced opposition when they presented to the State of Maryland the novel idea of a College solely dedicated to the education of women. In the early 1940's, Goucher students voiced opposition to the school's move from Baltimore to Towson, a change many thought would completely alter Goucher's character. For several decades during the war years, financial difficulties threatened the stability of Goucher's future. Persistence and loyalty on the part of the Goucher community always enabled us to overcome our problems.

Now, we are faced with a contemporary challenge; this is no time for recriminations. We, like our predecessors, must unite and adapt to change. Only through mutual support and optimism can we continue our proud history of academic excellence.

Former Goucher President Otto Kraushaar, witness to social change at Goucher during the 1960's, says today, as our forerunners must have thought during the challenges of the past, "I am confident that Goucher will triumph in the end."

As the conclusion of undergraduate years and the beginning of the next phase of education is celebrated by a commencement, so Goucher may be thought of as having reached its own commencement on May 10, 1986, fulfilling one stage of its destiny and preparing for a new departure. It is too soon to know how the College will meet the challenges that await it as it makes the transition to its new mission, but there are signs (perhaps omens) of continued vitality on the campus: in June 1986 faculty members sighted twin fawns frolicking near the woods behind the library. Whether the fawns are single sex or coeducational additions to the life of the campus remains to be discovered. In any event, they expressed with proper Goucher spirit the excitement of a new day in a new life.

Notes

Chapter 1. A Watershed Year: 1930

1. One is tempted—and the urge may not be entirely resisted in the following pages—to treat the events of the Robertson years in almost Manichean terms: a struggle between Good and Evil in which, happily, the former prevails in the end. A similar but more modern analogy might be suggested by Tolkien's *The Lord of the Rings*, though it would be difficult to picture President Robertson as Frodo the Hobbit. Perhaps imagining the scenario in terms of David and Goliath is most appropriate, with David Robertson prophetically named and Goliath represented by the combined impersonal forces of Depression and War. From any point of view, the advent of President Robertson, especially seen against the backdrop of the earlier history of the College and particularly the Guth years, clearly constitutes a renaissance in the evolution of the institution. This may justify beginning this sequel eight years before the end of the earlier history.

2. Transcript of oral interview by C. I. Winslow, March 25, 1971.

3. Transcript of oral interview by Jean H. Baker, July 25, 1973. The trustee in question was Mr. John Alcock, for whom Alcock House is named.

4. Transcript of oral interview by C. I. Winslow, May 12, 1971.

5. Knipp and Thomas, *The History of Goucher College*, pp. 299–300. One of the points of sharpest contrast between Presidents Guth and Robertson was that while Dr. Guth did raise money for the College, Dr. Robertson was decidedly ineffectual in this area. The Board of Trustees at that time was largely composed of members of old Baltimore families who, all too often, had little money to give and were reluctant to become involved in outside fund-raising.

6. An instance of his sometimes precipitous action occurred in early 1918, when anti-German sentiments were running very high. President Guth demanded the resignation of one of the most beloved and respected members of the faculty, Professor Hans Froelicher, on grounds that, while asserting complete loyalty to the United States, Professor Froelicher had expressed sympathy for the German people. (Froelicher was pure Swiss, incidentally, with not a drop of German blood.) A group of students devoted to Professor Froelicher wrote to

Mrs. Francis B. Sayre (Jessie Woodrow Wilson, '08), asking her to bring the matter to her father's attention. On Monday, May 6, President Wilson wrote from the White House to President Guth expressing his distress at the action of the trustees and asserting his complete faith in the loyalty of Professor Froelicher. President Guth reversed his decision and later tried to make up for what he came to realize was a great injustice. In 1929 Professor Froelicher succeeded Dr. Guth as acting president. (Wilson to Guth is cited in Baker, *Woodrow Wilson, Life and Letters*, pp. 124–26; see also Moment, "Guth and Academic Freedom," pp. 12–13; also transcript of oral interview of Hans Froelicher, Jr. by C. I. Winslow, n.d. [ca. 1972]).

7. *History of Goucher College*, pp. 307–8.

8. Transcript of oral interview by Kenneth O. Walker, May 4, 1972.

9. Dorothy Stimson, when she became acting president, asked to see the College budget and discovered there was none. (Transcript of oral interview by C. I. Winslow, March 18, 1971.)

10. Minutes of the Board of Trustees (hereafter cited as Trustee mins.), October 6, 1930.

Chapter 2. Restructuring the College (1930–1937)

1. Until 1931 the College had two deliberative bodies, the Board of Control and the Board of Instruction. The Board of Control, which consisted of certain senior faculty members and administrators, made policy recommendations to the president in matters usually pertaining to the academic program. The Board of Instruction, composed of the entire full-time faculty, was little more than a forum for debate.

2. The result of this program was to bring good students to the College in a time of declining enrollments.

3. Minutes of the Executive Committee, Board of Trustees (hereafter cited as Exec. Comm. mins.), December 18, 1930.

4. First drafts of the departmental self-evaluations take up sixty-seven pages following the March 16, 1931, minutes of the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees.

5. *History of Goucher College*, pp. 337–8.

6. President Robertson clearly deserves great credit for having brought about this long overdue revision in the College's system of governance.

7. The American Association of University Professors, the traditional protector of the tenure principle, was founded in 1915; the first Goucher chapter of the AAUP was organized on February 18, 1922.

8. A proposal for establishing a committee on reappointment, promotion, and tenure was discussed at length by the Faculty on February 14 and March 13, 1948, but since final action required changes in the by-laws, the decision was postponed until after President Kraushaar had taken office. On April 18, 1949, the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees approved the changes in the College by-laws that created the Committee on Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure, composed entirely of faculty members.

9. *History of Goucher College*, p. 338.

10. Trustee mins., May 23, 1932. Italics added.

11. *Ibid.*, May 23, 1932.

12. This is historically—if not logically—understandable; Dr. Lilian Welsh, founder of the Department of Physiology and Hygiene, also established the Physical Education Department in the early years of the College.

13. Minutes of the Faculty (hereafter cited as Fac. mins.), October 17, 1932.

14. The record was broken in 1969–70 when the Faculty—in the throes of

introducing the next major curricular and governance reforms in Goucher history—met twenty-three times!

15. The legislative document containing the provisions of the new plan is reproduced in the Minutes of the Faculty, May 14, 1934, and in the Minutes of the trustee Executive Committee, May 25, 1934.

16. It is interesting that while the 3-3-3 program (an annual student program of three courses in each of three terms) aroused widespread interest, no other institution copied it until the late fifties.

17. *History of Goucher College*, p. 426.

18. In its emphasis on objectives, the 1934 curriculum bears some resemblance to the core curriculum developed in 1981, which placed a similar stress on goals; see chapter 19.

19. *History of Goucher College*, pp. 345–46.

20. *Goucher College Weekly* (hereafter cited as *Weekly*), October 12, 1934.

21. *History of Goucher College*, pp. 350–51. Professor Kenneth O. Walker observes that by the time he came to Goucher in 1945, faculty and students had adjusted to the new program and were very proud of it. “Of all things, this was what made Goucher distinctive.” (To the author, February 23, 1985.)

22. A remarkably detailed eleven-page statistical summary of the results of the first Sophomore General Examination (1935) is appended to the minutes of the October 12, 1935, meeting of the Faculty.

23. Fac. mins., April 9, 1934.

24. Trustee mins., May 23, 1932.

25. Fac. mins., January 16, 1933.

26. *Ibid.*, November 9, 1935.

27. Transcript of oral interview by Kenneth O. Walker, May 4, 1972.

28. The president of the Alumnae Association Eleanor Diggs Corner had actually appointed the association’s first Adult Education Committee in 1930; it operated a program on a no-charge or very minimal charge basis from 1930 to 1933, distributing reading lists and providing free lectures and concerts. From 1934 to 1938, the Alumnae Association presented a series of weekly courses of college caliber given by members of the Goucher faculty. (For further developments in continuing education see chapters 9 and 19.)

29. In 1931–32 Professor Charles W. Lemmi was offering a four-semester sequence in elementary and intermediate Italian, followed by six semesters of Italian literature; but when he died in July, 1943, Italian disappeared temporarily from the curriculum. Elementary Portuguese, first offered in 1942, filled this gap until 1951, when it, too, was dropped. In 1951 French, German, and Spanish combined under a new title, the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures—a safe umbrella designation, given the circumstances. Elementary Italian returned in 1952, replacing elementary Portuguese, but it disappeared again in 1959 in favor of a three-term course in elementary Russian. Russian became a major in 1962.

30. Fac. mins., January 12 and April 13, 1935; February 13, 1937.

31. Dry promotions recurred during the Perry administration when the College again found itself in a highly unfavorable financial situation, but this time it was a faculty committee that recommended them since otherwise there would have been no promotions at all (see chapter 15).

32. Exec. Comm. mins., December 18, 1930.

33. *Ibid.*, January 26, 1935.

34. Fac. mins., December 12, 1932.

35. Exec. Comm. mins., October 31, 1933.

36. *History of Goucher College*, pp. 369–71.

37. Trustee mins., October 17, 1942.

38. Exec. Comm. mins., May 20, 1936.

39. Trustee mins., June 8, 1937. Even though, as of October 5, 1937, the College enrollment was 680, only 57 percent of the applicants had been accepted; obviously, despite the financial woes of the institution, standards were being carefully maintained.

40. This permanent Faculty Planning Committee is said to have been the first of its kind in the United States.

41. *Weekly*, October 1, 1937.

42. Trustee mins., June 8, 1937.

43. *History of Goucher College*, p. 33.

44. President Dorsey recently discovered in the course of her travels that the quasi-centenarian Zander machines had escaped the iron mongers and were still busily engaged in toning muscles at The Homestead, a large resort hotel in West Virginia.

45. *History of Goucher College*, p. 515.

46. *Weekly*, February 13, 1930.

47. Dean Emeritus Dorothy Stimson to the author, May 14, 1985. According to Dean Emeritus of Students Martha A. Nichols, a few select students were also asked to flutter and were carefully instructed by the Student Counselor, Frances Conner, in the correct dress and behavior.

48. *Weekly*, March 19, 1931.

49. *Ibid.*, November 3, 1932.

50. *History of Goucher College*, p. 485.

51. *Weekly*, April 23, 1932.

52. *Ibid.*, November 10, 1932.

53. *History of Goucher College*, p. 470.

54. Fac. mins., December 11, 1933.

55. Goucher students at this time habitually referred to their sororities as “fraternities.”

56. *Weekly*, January 24, 1936.

57. *Ibid.*, November 6, 1936.

58. In 1935–36, according to Dean Nichols, many students left the classroom at a given signal to support an Oxford peace rally. Faculty reaction to this activity varied from support to refusal to allow participants to return to class *that* period. (To the author, June 16, 1986.)

59. One of *Weekly*’s fancier touches in the late thirties was its habit of publishing reviews of foreign-language books composed in the same languages as the books themselves; a number of book reviews in French, Spanish, German, and Italian sprinkle *Weekly*’s pages in this period, the first (in French) appearing on December 3, 1937.

Chapter 3. *The Beginning of “Greater Goucher” (1938–1942)*

1. *History of Goucher College*, p. 262.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 300.

3. Transcript of oral interview by C. I. Winslow, March 18, 1971.

4. *History of Goucher College*, p. 391.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 392.

6. Transcript of oral interview by C. I. Winslow, September 20, 1972.

7. Transcript of oral interview by Kenneth O. Walker, March 25, 1971.

8. *History of Goucher College*, pp. 392–93.

9. Trustee mins., October 31, 1938.

10. *History of Goucher College*, pp. 387–88.

11. *Weekly*, September 30 and October 15, 1938.

12. *Ibid.*, February 28, 1939. The concept of residence halls subdivided into

several houses was apparently modeled on the Yale campus, where upperclassmen live in "colleges" with multiple subdivisions.

13. Ibid.

14. Exec. Comm. mins., June 7, 1939.

15. Ibid., November 14, 1939.

16. Ibid., December 5, 1932.

17. Ibid., February 13, 1940.

18. *Weekly*, March 1, 1940.

19. Trustee mins., May 28, 1940.

20. Ibid., June 4, 1940. According to the Minutes of the Executive Committee, July 29, 1940, \$323,290.15 had been subscribed to the campaign, but the accumulated deficit as of June 30 was \$132,543.38, which included \$34,355.43 for unbudgeted expenditures from the building fund.

21. Exec. Comm. mins., August 23, 1940.

22. Ibid., October 22, 1940.

23. *Weekly*, January 13 and March 3, 1939.

24. Ibid., April 29, 1938.

25. Ibid., February 9, 1940.

26. Ibid., January 26, 1940.

27. Exec. Comm. mins., January 14, 1941.

28. During this period some faculty members were encouraged to take leaves of absence; they did, and found jobs, often in activities unrelated to their professional expertise. (Professor Kenneth Walker to the author, February 23, 1985.)

29. Trustee mins., February 11, 1941. In 1974 the College eliminated the German major and terminated the position of Associate Professor Hertha Krotkoff. At the same time the Classics Department was discontinued, resulting in the loss of two additional faculty positions. A more detailed account of these relatively recent reductions appears in chapter 17 in the context of the period in which they occurred.

30. Ibid., March 11, 1941.

31. Ibid., April 8, 1941.

32. Trustee mins., June 9, 1941.

33. This technique continued to be used throughout the Kraushaar years.

34. Trustee mins., June 9, 1941.

35. For a complete list of the sales of buildings on the downtown campus, see table 4.

36. Exec. Comm. mins., November 4, 1941.

37. The College's first landscape architect was apparently too modest to sign his work; no trace of a clay bordered bed of primroses exists on the campus.

38. *Jonathan Edwards, 1703-1758: A Biography*, by Ola Elizabeth Winslow (New York: Macmillan Co., 1940).

39. *Weekly*, January 24, 1941.

40. Ibid., October 24, 1941.

41. Ibid., November 7, 1941.

42. Exec. Comm. mins., December 11, 1941.

43. "National Service, 1941-45" folder.

44. *Weekly*, January 16, 1942.

45. Janice Benario '43 and Irene Butterbaugh '43 to the author, September 9, 1985.

46. *Weekly*, January 30, 1942.

47. Exec. Comm. mins., February 10, 1942.

48. Fac. mins., February 28, 1942.

49. *Weekly*, February 20, 1942.

50. Transcript of oral interview of Professor C. I. Winslow by Kenneth O. Walker, May 4, 1972.

51. Exec. Comm. mins., March 29, 1948.
52. Fac. mins., January 9, 1943.
53. Ibid.
54. *Weekly*, February 5, 1943.
55. Ibid., April 16, 1943.
56. Fac. mins., March 13, 1943.
57. Exec. Comm. mins., June 7, 1943.
58. Ibid., September 27, 1943.
59. Ibid., May 14, 1945.
60. Fac. mins., June 7, 1946.

Chapter 4. *The Final Years of the Robertson Administration (1941–1948)*

1. *Weekly* articles appearing within one month include “Towson Dormitory is Progressing” (September 26, 1941), “Celebrate Raising of Dorm Ridge Pole” (October 3, 1941), and “Moore and Hutchins Explain Plans for Campus Buildings at a Greater Goucher” (October 24, 1941).

2. Exec. Comm. mins., January 13, 1942.

3. Ibid., February 10, 1942.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid., March 10, 1942.

6. Ibid., May 20, 1942.

7. *Weekly*, November 20, 1942.

8. Exec. Comm. mins., May 20, 1942.

9. Ibid., July 8, 1942.

10. *Weekly*, October 9, 1942.

11. Fac. mins., September 21, 1942. Professor Kenneth O. Walker notes that the very real problems of a dual campus lasted until 1952, but that adversity often has unexpected benefits. “Faculty and students riding the buses developed a marvelous *esprit de corps*. I doubt that College morale has ever been better than between 1945 and 1952.” (To the author, February 23, 1985.)

12. In a comment to the author Dr. Sara deFord, professor emeritus of English, noted that these subjects were chosen because they did not need “equipment.” She added that she taught in a trunkroom and later in the recreation room at a Ping-Pong table.

13. Vanaheim Hall was sold on May 13, 1942, to Dr. Leo Schlenger for \$9,500; Midgard was purchased by Federal Construction Corporation on May 23, 1942, for \$7,500; Gimle Annex was sold to H. Earle Rose on July 1, 1942, for \$5,000; Folkvang, Trudheim, Trudheim Annex, and Dunnock were collectively sold on August 26, 1942, to Kenneth Milford Cohen for \$16,000. For a complete list of sales of buildings on the downtown campus see table 4.

14. Trustee mins., October 17, 1942.

15. Fac. mins., November 14, 1942.

16. *Weekly*, November 13 and 20, 1942.

17. Exec. Comm. mins., April 12, 1943.

18. Ibid., October 18, 1943.

19. Ibid., May 8, 1944; November 26, 1945. The gate stood on Dulaney Valley Road at approximately the level of Mary Fisher Hall, just south of the present entrance to the beltway east.

20. Ibid., September 18, 1944.

21. Ibid., September 17, 1945.

22. Ibid., March 18, 1946.

23. Ibid., November 19, 1945.

24. Further details on the beltway and entrance road problems appear in chapters 7 and 8.

25. Exec. Comm. mins., September 23, 1946.
26. Trustee mins., December 11, 1946.
27. *Weekly*, February 7, 1947.
28. Fac. mins., March 8, 1947.
29. Exec. Comm. mins., May 12, 1947.
30. *Ibid.*, September 22, 1947.
31. *Weekly*, October 3, 1947.
32. *Ibid.*, December 5, 1947. Bennett House was named for Eleanor A. Bennett, in whose memory Benjamin Franklin Bennett, the donor of the original Bennett Hall, had named that building. Robinson House honored Myra Dodson Robinson, wife of Edward Levi Robinson, a trustee from 1913 to 1943, who in his will provided generously for her memorial. Dr. Lilian Welsh, one of the College's most memorable faculty members, came to Goucher in 1894 and founded Goucher's Department of Physiology and Hygiene, the first such department in a women's college.
33. *Ibid.*, November 14, 1947.
34. Exec. Comm. mins., December 15, 1947. It was symptomatic of the rise in construction costs during this period that the price for building Residence Hall No. 2 (the future Heubeck Hall) was estimated at \$1,352,631, approximately double the cost of \$619,698 for Mary Fisher Hall (*Ibid.*, November 24, 1947).
35. *Ibid.*, February 9, 1948.
36. Nature occasionally joined the depression and the war in assailing the College, notably in late May 1947, when a tornado struck Mary Fisher Hall. Luckily it was a small twister that did only minor damage to the building, though it uprooted several valuable trees (*Ibid.*, May 26, 1947).
37. *Ibid.*, June 7, 1948.
38. *Ibid.*, April 15, 1946; April 19, 1948.
39. *Ibid.*, March 10, 1947.
40. *Ibid.*, November 17, 1947.
41. For a complete list of sales of property on the downtown campus see table 4.
42. Exec. Comm. mins., January 6, 1947.
43. *Ibid.*, July 14, 1947.
44. *Ibid.*, September 22, 1947.
45. For details of these negotiations see chapter 8.
46. Exec. Comm. mins., September 27, 1943.
47. Trustee mins., January 20, 1946.
48. Julia Rogers, though not a Goucher alumna, was a Baltimore woman very interested in women's education.
49. Exec. Comm. mins., February 4, 1946.
50. *Ibid.*, August 30, 1943.
51. Trustee mins., October 21, 1943.
52. *Ibid.*, April 27, 1945.
53. According to Dorothy Stimson, the second Mrs. Robertson "was a joy! Dr. Robertson mellowed after he married his second wife. She would not let him be stiff and pompous." (To the author, May 14, 1985.)
54. Trustee mins., October 17, 1945.
55. *Ibid.*, October 16, 1946.
56. President Robertson bade farewell to the students by substituting for the annual spring receptions held at his house a student boatripe on Chesapeake Bay, an event that became a tradition under his successor, President Kraushaar (Exec. Comm. mins., April 26, 1948).
57. Miss Stimson retired after thirty-four years of service to the College as teacher and administrator in 1955 (Trustee mins., June 11, 1955). On April 18, 1955, the Executive Committee approved a resolution in her honor to be pre-

sented to her at the 1955 commencement, at which she would be the speaker. The College had awarded her the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws as part of the convocation held on February 15, 1951, at which John Fulton, professor of the history of science in the Yale Medical School, delivered the first Stimson Lecture (Exec. Comm. mins., November 13, 1950).

58. Exec. Comm. mins., February 9 and 23, 1948. Dr. Kelley served as acting dean until 1949 when Anne Gary Pannell was appointed to the office. Dr. Pannell left Goucher at the end of one year to become president of Sweet Briar College; she was succeeded in 1950 by Elizabeth Geen, whose tenure as dean lasted until 1968, when she, in turn, was succeeded by Rhoda M. Dorsey.

59. *Ibid.*, October 29 and November 26, 1945.

60. At this writing, Rhoda M. Dorsey has recently completed a term as president of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools; Goucher has been a member of the Association since the latter's founding in 1888.

61. Fac. mins., April 10, 1948. One effect of the abolition of the sororities was the isolation of the city students from the resident students; a benefit of the sororities had been to bring the two groups together socially.

62. Exec. Comm. mins., May 3, 1946.

63. *Weekly*, October 20, 1944.

64. Professor Kenneth O. Walker notes that while students were “in constant conflict” over it, the Tone Committee had its merits; “in the fifties, you should have heard our students comment contemptuously on the way students dressed at other women’s colleges.” (To the author, February 23, 1985.)

Chapter 5. Early Perceptions of Goucher by a New President (1948)

1. Dr. Kraushaar suffers the misfortune of having the most frequently mispronounced name of any Goucher president. His surname is pronounced “Kraus-haar,” not “Krau-shaar.” The two syllables, which mean “curly hair” in German, are enunciated separately, and the “sh” combination is not a single sound. (Compare the English word “grasshopper” with the descriptive phrase for one who goes out to buy grass: “grass shopper.”)

2. President Kraushaar soon learned to value Skip as a trustworthy and dependable member of the College workforce.

3. The trustee Executive Committee tabled on January 16, 1950, the idea of building faculty houses on campus; the idea apparently did not arise again except in the revised “Master Plan for the Towson Campus” (Goucher College Archives) presented by Mr. Hideo Sasaki in 1958. In any event, that aspect of the master plan was never carried out.

4. Many of Goucher’s competitors were accepting male veterans at the expense of females, thereby increasing applications to Goucher.

5. *History of Goucher College*, p. 343.

6. Dr. Kraushaar’s father was president of Wartburg College (“a struggling Lutheran institution at Clinton, Iowa; I had first seen the light of day in one of the college buildings”); his brother was president of a small Lutheran college in Texas.

Chapter 6. Completion of the “Minimal Campus” (1948–1954)

1. Trustee mins., October 25, 1948.

2. Heubeck and Stimson halls were deliberately built in stages. As a result, the reader may experience difficulty in identifying buildings under a succession of temporary names. The basic sequence of residence halls was as follows:

(1) Residence Hall No. 1, Mary Fisher Hall (1938–1942); (2) Residence Hall No. 2, begun in the Robertson administration, later called the Bennett-Robinson Dormitory (after the names of the first two completed houses), finished in several stages in the Kraushaar administration and finally named Anna Heubeck Hall (1947–58); (3) Residence Hall No. 3, Froelicher Hall (1949–50), begun after but completed before Heubeck Hall; and (4) Residence Hall No. 4, Stimson Hall (1960–66), also built deliberately in stages in order to permit a gradual increase in the size of the student body.

3. The building consumed by fire was the Barn, which Dr. Kraushaar discusses in chapter 7.

4. Pietro Belluschi, dean emeritus of the School of Architecture at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the architect of Goucher's College Center, agreed with Dr. Kraushaar about the dispersal of buildings in the original plan for the campus. In an undated oral interview by C. I. Winslow (ca. 1972), Dean Belluschi suggested that "the texture was a little bit too loose. . . . In my mind, and this is a personal feeling, you should not be afraid to get things closer together." The Faculty Planning Committee, however, apparently took a different view. According to the "Objectives and Summary of the Plan" accompanying the 1958 revised "Master Plan for the Towson Campus" prepared by Mr. Hideo Sasaki, "on November 8, 1957, the Faculty Planning Committee again strongly stated its position that there is 'the necessity for avoiding an appearance of crowdedness on the campus.' Dr. C. I. Winslow, chairman of the Faculty Planning Committee, wrote in a memorandum to President Kraushaar, 'The Committee wishes to go on record as not being in sympathy with any plan which would remove the sense of openness and spaciousness which now characterizes the campus.'" Sasaki proposed a compromise: build new buildings in clusters, with adequate green space between the clusters.

5. Trustee mins., January 18, 1949.

6. On November 22, 1948, the Executive Committee voted to recommend to the full board a campaign to raise \$2,000,000 "or so much of that amount as may be determined by the Campaign leadership as an attainable goal." The committee proposed three steps: (1) the enlistment of outstanding leadership, (2) a canvass of potential large donors, and (3) consideration of the advisability of a general appeal, with or without professional guidance. On December 12, 1949, the full board approved a resolution that \$2,000,000 be sought in a nationwide appeal to be launched in February 1950. (The campaign was successfully completed, but not until 1954.)

7. President Robertson was particularly concerned with the library and devoted to it the kind of special consideration that President Kraushaar later gave to the architecture and landscaping of the campus—which is not to say that either of them had unique points of focus, but rather that each developed particular interests that worked to the benefit of the College.

8. At the Board of Trustees meeting on October 25, 1948, President Kraushaar outlined his recommendations for the proper sequence of steps to take in order to move the current student body to the Towson campus: (1) complete enough facilities to house 190 additional students (the number currently in residence in the city); (2) complete the humanities building; (3) construct the library; (4) construct a combined auditorium, gymnasium, and student activities building; (5) complete the science building. At its meeting on November 22 the Executive Committee voted unanimously to accept President Kraushaar's recommendation to defer construction of the library and adopt Residence Hall No. 3 as the next building project.

9. Exec. Comm. mins., February 21, 1949.

10. The minutes of the Executive Committee's meeting on September 19, 1949, record the merger of the Alumnae Gift Fund into the Goucher Fund and

the transfer of alumnae records to the office of Mr. Donald Hammond. (For a more detailed treatment of the Alumnae Gift Building Campaign see chapter 10.)

11. On December 20, 1948, the Executive Committee had approved a three-bay extension to the northeast wing of Van Meter Hall to hold administrative offices.

12. At its meeting on December 6, 1948, the Executive Committee approved the selections of Messrs. Moore and Hutchins as architects for Residence Hall No. 3, which was to cost no more than \$850,000 overall. At this point, only the first two houses (Bennett and Robinson) of Residence Hall No. 2 had been completed; they housed ninety-seven students.

13. Exec. Comm. mins., April 4, 1949.

14. At this time, two other enhancements of the campus resulted from the Executive Committee's approval, on October 17, 1949, of President Kraushaar's motion to accept a bid of \$1,059 for a permanent riding ring on the campus, and the committee's further approval, on November 21, 1949, of a bid of \$1,025 for a second hockey field. (President Kraushaar had announced to the Board of Trustees on October 25, 1948, that the first hockey field had been completed.)

15. Exec. Comm. mins., September 18, 1950.

16. *Ibid.*, December 15, 1952.

17. Trustee mins., June 13, 1953.

18. It was, however, a good library with a notable lack of substandard or duplicate materials.

19. Mr. Hammond recommended the organization of a Board of Overseers to the Executive Committee on December 5, 1949; the full board met on December 12 to discuss the issue.

20. On September 18, 1950, President Kraushaar reported to the Executive Committee that Froelicher Hall—except for Alcock House—would be ready for occupancy by October 1, 1950. Alheim Hall would reopen to accommodate students scheduled for Alcock House. On October 2, 1950, the president announced to the committee that 135 students were now settled in Froelicher Hall, though West House was not yet completely finished. The dedication of Alcock House (named for Trustee and Treasurer John L. Alcock) would take place on October 28; the other Froelicher houses had not yet been given their final names.

21. The Executive Committee chose the name Froelicher Hall for Residence Hall No. 3 on February 13, 1950; the title honored both Dr. Hans Froelicher and his wife Dr. Frances Mitchell Froelicher, each of whom was a member of the original faculty of the College. The committee also voted to name Residence Hall No. 2 Guth Hall, subject to the approval of Mrs. Guth, and to name the houses of Mary Fisher Hall for Clara L. Bacon, professor of mathematics (1897–1934); Summerfield Baldwin, an incorporator of the College and later president of the Board of Trustees; Henry S. Dulaney, another former president of the board; and Lulie P. Hooper, '96, a powerful force in alumnae affairs and a trustee and benefactor of the College. On April 10, 1950, President Kraushaar informed the Executive Committee that, following a conference and correspondence with Mrs. Guth, "it seemed advisable to postpone the naming of a building for ex-President Guth until a more appropriate building had been constructed on the campus." (According to contemporary gossip, Mrs. Guth thought that naming a women's dormitory for a man was "not decent.") It was not until May 6, 1957, that the Executive Committee voted to name Residence Hall No. 2 Anna Heubeck Hall.

22. Mr. John L. Seaton of Maplewood, New Jersey, visited the College on April 1, 1951, on behalf of the Kresge Foundation. (Exec. Comm. mins., May 28, 1951.)

23. The minutes of the Executive Committee meeting on February 11, 1952, state that the Kresge grant of \$250,000 had been approved, but there were complications to be worked out: Goucher was to raise its matching sum of \$250,000 by December 31, 1952; the Hoffberger family, on the other hand, was planning to pay its grant of \$250,000 over a nine-year period. The minutes of March 3 indicate that the Kresge Foundation refused to accept Hoffberger pledges as a matching sum and insisted on new cash. President Kraushaar agreed to try to reconcile the family differences. On March 10 Dr. Kraushaar informed the Executive Committee that Mr. Kresge refused to budge: the College would have to raise \$250,000. The Executive Committee responded by appointing a Steering Committee to lay plans immediately “for a solicitation of funds this spring.”

24. President Kraushaar informed the Executive Committee on January 12, 1953, that he had sent to the Kresge Foundation an auditor’s report showing that the College had raised \$263,000 to match the Kresge grant of \$250,000.

25. On September 18, 1950, President Kraushaar informed the Executive Committee that the post office and business office had been installed in Robinson House with the College bank and a central switchboard with nine trunk lines; Mary Fisher now had a snack bar and an office for laundry and dry cleaning. Moreover, Van Meter Hall’s parking lot was finished, and classroom furniture and equipment had all come from Goucher Hall. The College had awarded a contract for a greenhouse and had installed an automatic lighting system on the campus. All this had taken place during the summer of 1950.

26. President Kraushaar informed the Executive Committee on September 21, 1953, that through the influence of Dr. Helen Dodson, ’27, the Yerkes Observatory proposed to install a six-inch refractor telescope on an equatorial mount in the dome of the new science building at a cost of approximately \$1,500. The committee accepted this generous offer and proposed to name the instrument the Lewis telescope in honor of Dr. Florence Lewis, professor emerita of mathematics (1908–1947).

27. The original agreement with the Hoffberger family stipulated that the science building would be named the Hoffberger Hall of Science. On June 9, 1953, the Executive Committee rescinded its earlier action naming the original unit of the science building the Lilian Welsh Laboratory and voted instead to name the new gymnasium Lilian Welsh Hall. At the same meeting the committee awarded to William T. Lyons, Inc. a \$436,000 contract for construction of the gymnasium. On June 29, 1953, President Kraushaar informed the Executive Committee that the Hoffberger family had agreed to change the name of the science building to the Hoffberger Science Building rather than Hoffberger Hall of Science.

Chapter 7. Completing the Campus: The Final Stage

1. Exec. Comm. mins., December 21, 1953.

2. The Executive Committee voted on October 6, 1952, to name South House of Froelicher Hall Tuttle House in honor of Charlotte Tuttle Hampton, ’95, a recent benefactor of the College. (The name Hampton House was rejected to avoid confusion with the College’s historic neighbor to the north.) Alcock House, as we have seen, had been named in 1950. When the Executive Committee finally named Froelicher Hall’s West House for Katherine Jeanne Gallagher, professor of history (1915–48), on May 6, 1957, the roster of Mary Fisher and Froelicher houses was complete.

3. Exec. Comm. mins., September 14, 1953.

4. Ibid., September 20, 1954.

5. Trustee mins., February 18, 1956.

6. Exec. Comm. mins., August 20, 1956.
7. *Ibid.*, May 25, 1953.
8. *Ibid.*, June 25, 1956.
9. Trustee mins., October 19, 1957. Mr. Sasaki had been approved by the Executive Committee on February 11, 1957, as consultant and site planner for the campus.
10. Exec. Comm. mins., May 17, 1954.
11. *Ibid.*, May 22, 1961.
12. *Ibid.*, November 1, 1954.
13. *Ibid.*, February 6, 1956.
14. *Ibid.*, September 8, 1958.
15. Trustee mins., October 22, 1955.
16. *Ibid.*, February 18, 1956; Exec. Comm. mins., February 27, 1956.
17. Exec. Comm. mins., June 18 and October 8, 1956; April 15, 1957.
18. *Ibid.*, August 20, 1956.
19. *Ibid.*, September 10, 1956.
20. *Ibid.*, November 18, 1957.
21. The undated written commentary, “Objectives and summary of the Plan,” which accompanies the drawings and completes the plan, postdates this meeting of the Executive Committee; hence, the full plan must have appeared in early 1958.
22. At present, the Russian section of the Goucher Modern Languages Department serves not only the needs of Goucher students, but also those of the Johns Hopkins University; the Goucher faculty members hold joint appointments with the University, which contributes to their support.
23. Trustee mins., February 28, 1959.
24. *Ibid.*, June 13, 1959.
25. *Ibid.*, October 23, 1954; Exec. Comm. mins., December 13, 1954. Pietro Belluschi was dean emeritus of the School of Architecture and Planning at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
26. Exec. Comm. mins., March 16, 1959.
27. *Ibid.*, May 18 and June 1, 1959.
28. *Ibid.*, October 21, 1963.
29. Trustee mins., October 12, 1963.
30. Exec. Comm. mins., March 9 and August 10, 1959.
31. *Ibid.*, November 26, 1962.
32. *Ibid.*, October 24, 1964.
33. *Ibid.*, April 13, 1959.
34. *Ibid.*, June 6, 1960.
35. *Ibid.*, September 26, 1960.
36. *Ibid.*, February 13 and March 13, 1961.
37. *Ibid.*, March 4 and April 29, 1963; November 9, 1964.
38. *Ibid.*, August 10, 1959.
39. The planned location of the Health Center shifted several times before the facility finally reached its present site as a separate building.
40. Trustee mins., June 11, 1960.
41. Exec. Comm. mins., November 7, 1960.
42. *Ibid.*, January 30, 1961.
43. *Ibid.*, October 16, 1961; April 2, 1962.
44. *Ibid.*, April 30, 1962. On September 5, 1962, the committee authorized a contract for stage two of Stimson Hall at an estimated cost of \$543,600. In the same month, stage one was completed in time for the opening of College. (*Ibid.*, October 8, 1962.)
45. *Ibid.*, October 15, 1962. Lewis House was occupied in the fall of 1964. (Trustee mins., October 24, 1964.)
46. Trustee mins., May 15, 1965.

47. Exec. Comm. mins., February 15, 1960.
48. *Ibid.*, May 9, 1960; April 16, 1962.
49. *Ibid.*, January 7, 1963.
50. Trustee mins., October 24, 1964.
51. During the thirties the College had given an option to buy Bennett Hall and later forgot about it. The option was exercised shortly after the Second World War, and Goucher suddenly found itself without a gymnasium.
52. On October 9, 1950, President Kraushaar called to the Executive Committee's attention the Physical Education Department's desperate need for facilities. The committee voted to duplicate the current service building at a cost of \$17,000 for the temporary use of the Physical Education Department "while plans are being pushed for the construction of a permanent gymnasium."
53. President Kraushaar took the plunge clad in a business suit, but if Miss von Borries appeared to him "fully clothed," it was probably because she was wearing a vintage (circa 1910) bathing suit with a slightly younger Goucher tanksuit underneath. The Board of Trustees voted on May 21, 1966, to name the new swimming pool for Eline von Borries.
54. Exec. Comm. mins., January 8 and October 8, 1962. At the latter meeting President Kraushaar noted that the College Center and the Health Center were occupied in part, though not yet completed, and that the language laboratory was in the process of moving from Mary Fisher Hall to space in the library vacated by the Bookstore, then in the College Center.
55. *Ibid.*, October 8, 1962.
56. The Plant Laboratory was originally built in 1951.
57. Exec. Comm. mins., April 18, 1966.

Chapter 8. Goucher's Remarkable Real Estate Transactions

1. When President Kraushaar reported to the trustee Executive Committee on December 17, 1951, that he had received a verbal offer to buy Goucher House, the committee voted to accept the offer and provide adequate quarters on the Towson campus for the Alumnae Association, which was then occupying the building. (The students who had previously lived there had already moved out to the Towson campus.)
2. "Master Plan for the Towson Campus."
3. On June 13, 1959, Mr. Eney informed a joint meeting of the Boards of Trustees and Overseers that the Towson Plaza Shopping Center had opened on May 13, with rentals complete except for some office space. Annual income from the shopping center was \$140,000 in the early years of its operation.
4. Exec. Comm. mins., September 21, 1953.
5. President Kraushaar reported to the Executive Committee on May 26, 1952, that the Towson Methodist Church was interested in purchasing four to five acres of tract on which to build a new church. On February 2, 1953, the committee offered the Methodists "not less than five acres" of land at \$7,000 an acre. A week later, on February 9, the committee reduced the price by selling six acres for \$35,000, since the buyer was a church. The committee learned on June 25, 1956, that this sale had finally been completed. Eight years later, on April 20, 1964, the committee approved the sale of slightly over ten additional acres to the Towson Methodist Church for \$40,000.
6. The Executive Committee approved the current site of the branch of the Peabody Institute on March 18, 1957, and approved the lease on March 3, 1958. The lease gave the Peabody Institute the use of the land for fifty years (February 1, 1958 to January 31, 2008,) with the option to renew for twenty-five additional years. The annual rent for the first fifty years was \$1,250 net, Peabody being responsible for all taxes and other expenses that might be incurred.

In the event that Peabody exercised its option to renew the lease for an additional twenty-five years, the rent would be adjusted to reflect the difference between the U.S. Bureau of Labor Consumer Price Index for calendar 1957 and the average of the Consumer Price Indices for the five years prior to the expiration of the original lease.

7. Exec. Comm. mins., February 2, 1953.

8. As we have seen, the original gateway and entrance road were located several hundred yards directly north of their current location opposite Locustvale Road; the first entrance had originated as a roadway cut for construction vehicles because it provided the most direct route to the first building sites. The architectural plan of the campus had always envisaged a more southerly entrance from Dulaney Valley Road.

9. "Master Plan for the Towson Campus."

Chapter 9. Faculty, Students, and Curriculum (1948–1967)

1. Continuity in the Department of Modern Languages resembles that of the Art Department and also stems from Professor Hans Froelicher, whose first title was associate professor of French language and literature. When the College celebrated its one hundredth year of teaching in 1988, the French section boasted that three of its members had collectively spanned ninety-nine of these first one hundred years. The sequence involved Professors Froelicher, Seibert, and Thormann; the only year in which none of the three taught between 1888 and 1988 was 1959.

2. On December 20, 1955, President Kraushaar informed the Executive Committee of a grant from the Ford Foundation of \$444,400 for faculty salary increases. One third of this amount could be used for other purposes if the College deemed such use advisable.

3. Concerning the admission of black students, see chapter 11.

4. The A course had originated in a program worked out jointly by Goucher and Western High School; it anticipated the Advanced Placement Program of the College Entrance Examination Board, which the Faculty approved on January 12, 1957.

5. In 1949–50 Goucher followed another national trend by requiring the aptitude and achievement tests of the College Entrance Examination Board for admission to the College. According to President Kraushaar, "we made this decision with the enthusiastic approval of Mary Ross Flowers, who had been appointed to the office of Director of Admissions in 1949. For the first time in some years we had a better measure of the caliber of the entering students whom we had accepted and who had accepted the College. The point was not to put our sole reliance on the College Board test scores, but to use them along with other data to bring in a class that we felt was suitable to the level and kind of academic program Goucher was offering."

6. A new grant of \$72,000 in 1953 replenished the first grant made in 1951. (Exec. Comm. mins., February 9, 1953.)

7. President Kraushaar announced to the Board of Trustees on June 13, 1953, that the graduate program in teacher training, first directed by Professor Esther Crane, would begin in the fall. He had already informed the Executive Committee (on April 13, 1953) of the Ford Foundation grant of \$75,000 for the program; on May 25 he reported to the committee that the Ford Foundation had added \$30,000 to the grant, for a total of \$105,000, and on February 6, 1956, he was able to announce a further grant of \$61,200 which would allow recruitment of thirty to forty students per year up to 1960. By the fall of 1955, all of Goucher's teacher education programs were accredited by the State of Maryland and, by compact, with some twenty other states (Exec. Comm. mins., Septem-

ber 19, 1955). On April 24, 1961, the Executive Committee approved, in accordance with federal legislation, the admission of a male applicant to the Master's degree program, and in 1963 Howard Long was awarded the M.Ed. degree, becoming the first male graduate of Goucher College. The graduate program in elementary education came to an end in 1975.

8. The result of the radical overhaul of the curriculum with which Dean Emeritus Elizabeth Geen is largely credited is often referred to as the 1958 curriculum. While this term is convenient, it is somewhat misleading; the curricular reform began with major revisions of the curriculum of the lower division, that is, the freshman and sophomore years. It was this set of changes that was introduced in 1958. But the Curriculum Committee did not stop there and proceeded to make numerous changes in the curriculum of the upper division during the late fifties and early sixties. The redesigned academic program of the Kraushaar period is a result of both of these successive sets of changes.

9. A native of Dallas, Texas, Elizabeth Geen received her A.B. degree from the University of California and her A.M. and Ph.D. degrees from the University of Iowa. After teaching at Mills College in California, she became Dean of Women and Associate Professor of English at Alfred University in 1946. From there she came to Goucher as Dean in 1950.

10. President Kraushaar's views on general education were significantly influenced by the postwar general education program at Harvard (see chapter 5).

11. Jencks and Riesman, *The Academic Revolution*, p. 498.

12. The courses were Humanities 1-2, "Introduction to the Arts," and Social Sciences 1-2, "Problems in Public Affairs," both introduced in 1952–53, and Natural Science 1-2, "Concepts and Methods in the Natural Sciences," introduced in 1954–55 and a year later divided into Biological Science 1-2, "Introduction to Biological Science," and Physical Science 1-2, "Concepts and Methods in Physical Science."

13. Geen to the author, May 1986.

14. Geen, "Strengths and Weaknesses of the Goucher Curriculum."

15. Ibid.

16. No further attempts were made after 1957 to create Goucher's own tests, though the requirement that students take the College Board Area Tests was not actually abolished until 1966.

17. In 1951 the language requirement ceased to be a part of the Sophomore General Examination and was instead stated in terms of satisfactory completion of certain courses. Students beginning a new language now had to complete the second half of the intermediate level (four terms); those whom the appropriate department initially placed above the beginning offering were required to complete one literature course beyond the intermediate level (a maximum of four terms).

18. In 1952–53 the College introduced the sacred scriptures requirement for the degree. Scriptural knowledge could be demonstrated by completion of one appropriate course or by examination.

19. On March 9, 1963, this was further amended to read: "a total of four courses, of which at least one in the biological sciences (including psychology) and at least one in the physical sciences (chemistry, mathematics, physics, astronomy), with at least one course a laboratory course."

20. Interestingly, one of the report's positive recommendations was that Goucher introduce the field of accounting into the curriculum, not because the liberal arts tradition demanded instruction in that area, but because the evaluation team felt that all educated citizens should have some familiarity with a tool that would inevitably have a strong impact on their lives. The corresponding recommendation today, of course, is to require all students to demonstrate an appropriate degree of proficiency in the use of the computer.

21. "Report on the Educational Program of the Upper Curriculum."

22. Ibid.
23. Ibid.
24. Prior to 1959, honors at graduation had been granted only for work in the major.
25. "Report on Educational Program."
26. Fac. mins., December 11, 1959.
27. In "President Kraushaar Reports on 19 Years," a reprint (distributed by the Development Office) of his report delivered at the January 21, 1967, meeting of the governing boards, Dr. Kraushaar wrote: "The development of the formal curriculum of the College is the work above all of Dean Elizabeth Geen, who has labored ceaselessly to give it an ordered form and character and to develop in the student a sense of chartered freedom, the hallmark of a sound educational program. . . . By working cooperatively with the dean on committees, students have gained new insights into how a curriculum is created and administered. And beyond these professional achievements, uncounted students remember her for her sympathetic counsel and assistance."
28. The Committee on the Future of the College is the subject of chapter 14.
29. The option of pass-fail did not enter into the computation of the grade-point average.
30. The opportunities stressed in 1949–50 were the junior year in France with Sweet Briar College or in Geneva with Smith College. The junior year in Munich with Smith appeared in the 1955–56 catalog; in 1958–59 Wayne State University had taken over the Munich program, while Smith added Madrid and Florence to its Geneva option. The New York University in Paris program appeared on the list in 1963–64, and Smith added Paris and Hamburg in 1968–69. Beginning in 1970–71 no specific limits were placed on foreign study programs other than approval of the dean and the major advisor. Approved foreign study was not limited to Europe; on January 8, 1949, the Faculty approved a Goucher Summer School in Mexico.
31. Fac. mins., May 12, 1961.
32. Ibid.
33. Ibid., June 18, 1962.
34. From 1930 to 1933 the Alumnae Association program operated on a no-cost or minimal charge basis; reading lists were distributed, and free lectures and concerts were presented by volunteers. From 1934 to 1938 Goucher faculty taught a series of weekly courses of college caliber for which a nominal fee was charged, permitting the program to be self-supporting. Between 1938 and 1948 adult education was limited to symposia held during reunion, but in 1948 a gift from an alumna made possible the revival of the program, which continued throughout the Kraushaar years.
35. Exec. Comm. mins., June 4, 1962.
36. Fac. mins., February 10, 1962.
37. Ibid.
38. Ibid., May 11, 1963.
39. Ibid., May 9, 1964.
40. Ibid., January 8, 1966.
41. Ibid., November 11, 1962.
42. On April 13, 1963, the Faculty learned that as a result of faculty comments on the unsuitability of the term non-Western to describe the program, the catalog title was to be changed to "Program in Latin American, African, and Asian Cultures."
43. On February 8, 1964, President Kraushaar announced to the Faculty that thirteen U.S. colleges had entered into the U.S.-Indian Women's College Exchange Program; Goucher would participate in 1965–66.

1. This conception of the alumnae concerning their relationship or lack of it to the College extended at least from the days of President Guth and the 4–2–1 Campaign, though its origins may, in fact, antedate that period. In any event, no doubt primarily as a result of the depression, but perhaps also because of the rather heavy-handed way in which President Guth prevailed on students to pledge the very large sum (in contemporary currency) of \$421 as a contribution to the rebuilding of the College in Towson, the alumnae who had graduated in the late twenties and the thirties were disinclined to show great enthusiasm in responding to appeals coming from the College.

2. On May 25, 1985, Ms. Patricia Goldman, chairman of the trustee Development Committee, informed the Board of Trustees of the death of Judge Sarah T. Hughes, who had bequeathed to the College the balance of her estate “for the use by the Department of Political Science in its program of practical training and education in government and politics administered as of this date by the Field Politics Center.”

3. Total gifts to the Corporate Support Program for 1954–55 amounted to \$22,690; the goal for 1956 was set at \$40,500 (Exec. Comm. mins., November 28, 1955). The 75th Anniversary Fund, at the end of 1955, stood at \$607,500 (ibid., December 20, 1955).

4. The Todds’ goal for this endowment was later increased to \$500,000 and then to \$750,000, the amount necessary for a fully endowed faculty chair. In December 1972 the Todd professorship became the first fully endowed chair in the College.

5. President Kraushaar informed the Executive Committee of the receipt of this grant on October 2, 1961.

6. On June 13, 1964, the Board of Trustees approved the engagement of Marts and Lundy to do a survey to assess the feasibility of beginning a new, small campaign, and on May 15, 1965, the Board decided, on the basis of Marts and Lundy’s report, to run a campaign for \$1,510,000, the proceeds to be used for construction of the science lecture hall, the swimming pool, and a small theatre.

7. The 75th Anniversary Events Committee was composed of faculty, staff, trustees, and alumnae. From the faculty and staff: Harry Casey, Jr., Brownlee Corrin, Rhoda Dorsey, Alice Falvey [Greif], Helen Funk, Elliott Galkin, Belle Otto [Talbot], Olive Quinn, Eleanor Spencer, and Kenneth O. Walker; from the trustees and alumnae: Mrs. Charles D. Harris, Mr. Frank Kaufman, Mr. Walter Sondheim, Mrs. Saul Schary, Mrs. Robert Wagner, Mrs. Milton C. Whitaker.

8. His work on this council was one of President Kraushaar’s major contributions to Baltimore.

9. Kraushaar, “Report of the President 1958/1960,” p. 30.

Chapter 11. *Controversies and Dilemmas*

1. Walker to the author, February 23, 1985.

2. Nichols to the author, September 10, 1985.

3. An institution originally established for black students, the former college is now Morgan State University.

4. Exec. Comm. mins., April 4, 1955. On motion of Judge Sarah T. Hughes, at the meeting on June 11, the full board voted unanimously to approve the recommendation of the Executive Committee.

5. In the early fifties President Kraushaar played a significant role, as a member of the Governor’s Commission on Interracial Problems and Relations (later named the Commission on Human Relations), in helping to deal with problems in the Baltimore schools after their desegregation and in bringing

about the desegregation of department stores, hotels, restaurants, and other forms of public accommodation in the state, and in Baltimore in particular.

6. In October 1954 several Goucher trustees were serving on the Commission on Higher Education for the State of Maryland; the Commission was planning a program to expand existing state institutions and provide new institutions for post-high school education. The question of state aid to private institutions was also before the commission. (Trustee mins., October 23, 1954.)

7. President Kraushaar reported this feeling on the part of the Executive Committee to the full board on October 23, 1954.

8. The basic inequities that deterred the Executive Committee are not obvious to the naked eye, nor did they prevent most of the private colleges in Maryland from participating. The program had essentially the same features as most such state-sponsored programs, and, according to Mr. Sondheim, the basic problem lay, not in the program itself, but in the fact that it was, precisely, sponsored by the state.

9. Trustee mins., October 22, 1960.

10. Dr. Kraushaar's point was that since federal and state governments were heavily involved in pouring money into higher education, any institution that refused to participate would soon fall far behind its competitors in terms of financial resources. Moreover, if an institution did not accept government-sponsored research grants, science faculty would soon move to colleges and universities that did accept them, and students would enroll in schools that accepted government-supported student aid.

11. Public Law 85-864, Title X, sec. 1001 (f) reads: "No part of any funds appropriated or otherwise made available for expenditure under authority of this Act shall be used to make payments or loans to any individual unless such individual (1) has executed and filed with the Commissioner an affidavit that he does not believe in, and is not a member of and does not support any organization that believes in, or teaches, the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence or by any illegal or unconstitutional methods, and (2) has taken and subscribed to an oath or affirmation in the following form: 'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies, foreign and domestic.'"

12. The disclaimer affidavit was clearly a product of McCarthyism, a phenomenon on which Dr. Kraushaar comments: "My arrival at Goucher happened to coincide with the onset of what is now known as McCarthyism, that is, the accusations made by Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin when fear of Communist infiltration and subversion was very widespread. During the Cold War, Senator McCarthy's wild accusations, broadcast by radio and television, of Communist infiltration into the State Department and other departments of government and into intellectual circles generally, created widespread suspicions—usually unfounded—of disloyalty and treason. An atmosphere developed in which even a middle-of-the-road liberal could become the object of very serious and dangerous accusations. This pervasive public fear reached a point at which I was even the recipient of anonymous and threatening telephone calls."

13. On February 9, 1959, the Executive Committee agreed to cease participating in the NEA student loan program, which "contains unsatisfactory terms," and President Kraushaar explained the position to the full board on June 13.

14. President Kraushaar informed the Board of Trustees on October 20, 1962, that the Disclaimer Affidavit had been repealed by Congress, though the Oath of Allegiance remained. On November 26 the Executive Committee authorized the president to make application for loans under Public Law 87-935.

15. More precisely, the criterion that, according to situation ethics, deter-

mines the legitimacy of a moral decision is whether or not it is motivated by *agape*, the term by which the Greeks characterized the highest form of love, the love that seeks only the well-being of the loved one. For a full treatment of the subject, see Joseph Fletcher, *Situation Ethics, the New Morality* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966).

16. On December 21, 1964, President Kraushaar outlined to the Executive Committee the steps the College was taking to counteract adverse criticism of the sermon. The trustees endorsed a letter by Bishop Doll of the Episcopal Diocese of Maryland that had appeared in the *Evening Sun* of December 21, 1964, and the letter from Dr. Kraushaar to the alumnae. President Kraushaar was asked to convey to Chaplain Wood the fact that these documents represented the position of the College as accepted by the Executive Committee. On April 5, 1965, the Executive Committee approved Chaplain Wood's reappointment for one year on the grounds that "negligible risks" were outweighed by the greater risk of reopening the controversy and damaging his reputation by dismissing him.

A year after the sex sermon Dr. Wood received and accepted an offer of the chaplaincy at Vassar College. Several years later, he developed leukemia and died within a matter of months.

Chapter 12. Student Life in the Kraushaar Era

1. Someone should have kept an eye on the sign painter's spelling: at one time in the sixties a large sign appeared on the College's service road warning drivers that they were about to cross a "bridal path."

2. For example, the May Queen and her Court appeared for the last time at May Fair in 1965.

3. College food, for instance, continued to be a source of comment, as exemplified by an article in the issue of November 30, 1951, titled "Breakfast at Goucher: Morning Becomes Electrifying."

4. *Weekly*, October 29, 1948.

5. *Ibid.*, May 5, 1951.

6. *Ibid.*, November 7, 1952.

7. Fortunately for dramatic purposes, the late afternoon hour was still in effect for President Kraushaar's inauguration on May 7, 1949. As he rose to speak, a clap of thunder caused some in the audience to take cover, and the new president began his remarks by observing: "Even the gods are stirring uneasily on this occasion." But just as he finished his address, a momentary break in the clouds permitted a ray of sunshine to beam down on the audience—obviously a good omen of a kind the gods cannot easily produce when such ceremonies are held in the limited and protected confines of today's Kraushaar Auditorium.

8. *Weekly*, May 8, 15, 22, and 29, 1959; Exec. Comm. mins., May 4, 18, and 25, 1959. (As we shall see in chapter 16, Goucher finally completed the marathon and won the "Bowl" a decade later, in 1969.)

9. Exec. Comm. mins., October 13, 1961 and February 22, 1963. Ultimately, the courts found for the students. According to Dean Emeritus of Students Martha A. Nichols, it was easy to identify a Goucher student in a sit-in: she was the one carrying a bag with her books to study in jail. Indeed, social activism and academic demands were often in conflict. Dean Nichols recalls a group of students who were being held in the detaining cell of the Baltimore City jail who requested that the dean of students visit them *and* that she bring the necessary books to allow one of the detainees to study for an upcoming quiz. Another student's only concern was that the administration remember that she was twenty-one and not notify her parents, since her father was, she said, "a conservative with a bad heart."

Chapter 13. *Student Activism: The Temper of the Times*

1. Shorter were the administrations of Presidents Noble (three years) and Hersey (four years); longer were those of President Guth (sixteen years), Presidents Goucher and Robertson (eighteen years each), and President Kraushaar (nineteen years). President Dorsey completed the first twelve years of her continuing administration at the end of academic year 1984–85.

2. Dr. Perry, a native of Powaton, Virginia, received his A.B. degree at the University of Virginia and his A.M. and Ph.D. degrees in English at Harvard University. After teaching at the University of Virginia from 1947–51, Dr. Perry went to Washington and Lee University, rising from assistant professor to professor of English and chairman of the department before returning in 1960 to the University of Virginia as professor of English and dean of admissions. It was from his alma mater that he moved to Goucher as president in 1967.

3. Obear, "Student Activism in the Sixties," p. 12.

4. *Ibid.*, pp. 13–14.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 14.

6. The reader may recall President Kraushaar's distress over the *Goucher Weekly's* harsh statements concerning the College in the mid-sixties, not to mention the newspaper's attacks on the administration.

7. The term direct action referred to sit-ins, demonstrations and other activities that might be technically illegal.

8. "Student Activism in the Sixties," pp. 17–18.

9. *Ibid.*, pp. 18–19.

10. This principle was not unquestioned: "The idea of self-government in communities whose members all expect to be gone in a couple of years may well be unworkable. Lacking a deep stake in the future of the community as a whole, students naturally have a disproportionate interest in protecting their civil liberties as against meeting their civic responsibilities." (*The Academic Revolution*, p. 57).

11. Even when most intent on upsetting the rules, Goucher students often betrayed a reluctance to work outside them—a paradox illustrated by the undergraduate who approached Dean of Students Martha Nichols and announced that she would like to "schedule a riot." (Dean Nichols asked her if she would need the public address system.)

12. "Student Activism in the Sixties," p. 22.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 23–24.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 22.

15. Miles, *The Radical Probe: The Logic of Student Rebellion*, pp. 258–59.

16. Exec. Comm. mins., October 9, 1967. The Faculty approved the self-scheduling of examinations (with certain restrictions) on October 14, 1967.

17. *Weekly*, January 26, 1968.

18. *Ibid.*, February 16, 1968.

19. The moving memorial service for Dr. King that filled Kraushaar Auditorium to overflowing brought the College together in a manner not generally characteristic of those divisive times.

20. *Weekly*, April 26, 1968. When the Field Politics Center held its mock election in November 1968, Humphrey won with 326 votes to 84 for Nixon and 4 for Wallace (*ibid.*, November 8, 1968).

21. *Ibid.*, May 17, 1968. The Committee on the Future of the College is the subject of chapter 14.

22. Exec. Comm. mins., September 23, 1968.

23. The hourly-wage earners did unionize later on, with serious consequences for the budget—a matter taken up in chapters 15 and 20.

24. In response, the President's Council circulated a statement to faculty members suggesting guidelines covering both freedoms and responsibilities of the faculty; faculty members tended to interpret the guidelines variously in accordance with their own political positions.

25. It should be noted, however, that at Goucher, like most similar academic institutions, the percentage of true radicals, as opposed to liberal activists, was very small. According to Michael Miles (*The Radical Probe*, p. 17,) "The evidence suggests that 10 percent at a minimum of the student population of elite universities may be aligned with, if not continuously active in, the radical movement in advance of any particular 'contagion of excitement.'" Miles notes that this figure can be reduced by "drowning" the movement in the total student population of the United States, including denominational institutions, military academies, and so on, "but even 2 percent of the total constitutes the formidable number of 150,000 radical constituents." At colleges of Goucher's size the radical population was probably no more than 5 percent of the total, though many more moderate dissenters often participated in demonstrations arising from issues of broad local or national interest.

26. *Weekly*, May 2, 1969.

27. The principal founder and editor of *Echo*, Carol L. Krugman '70, was Goucher's Centennial Commencement speaker in 1985.

28. It was Mr. Matilla's motion in support of the petition, not the petition itself, that was tabled at the Faculty meeting on May 10.

29. *Weekly*, May 23, 1969.

30. Gail Anderson, president of the senior class, led the procession to the chapel, where the students' honors convocation began with the singing of the hymn "Once to Every Man and Nation." A prayer, written and read by Donna Prouty, followed. The awards and prizes were presented by Ms. Anderson, who also honored the seniors elected to Phi Beta Kappa. Barbara Patterson recited "all ignorance toboggins into know" by e. e. cummings, the yearbook was presented to the senior class by its editor, Dianne Schwab, and the convocation concluded with a closing benediction read by Nancy Hall and the hymn "O God, Our Help in Ages Past." Meanwhile, the official honors convocation proceeded as usual despite the absence of many of the honorees.

31. *Ibid.*, September 26, 1969; Exec. Comm. mins., October 6, 1969.

32. Trustee mins., October 25, 1969.

33. *Weekly*, May 8, 1970.

34. Fac. mins., May 16, 1970.

35. The concert program, played by the Baltimore Chamber Orchestra and sung by the Goucher Glee Club and Chapel Choir with soloists from the community and the College, consisted of works appropriate to a time of crisis: The National Anthem; "We Shall Overcome"; Copland's "A Lincoln Portrait"; Hindemith's "Trauermusik" ("in memory of the victims at Kent State University, Jackson State College, and all who have died for democracy"); Mendelssohn's Piano Concerto No. 1; "Deep River"; Handel's "Vouchsafe, O Lord" from "Dettingen Te Deum"; and Copland's "Simple Gifts." A free-will offering was collected by Students' Organization to support non-partisan activities in behalf of peace.

36. While the College addressed all these points, the last one has so far met with little success, largely because the demand on the part of many academic institutions for black faculty and administrative personnel still far exceeds the supply.

37. This has been characteristic of undergraduates since the mid-seventies.

38. Exec. Comm. mins., January 10, 1972.

39. Trustee mins., January 27, 1973.

1. “Report of the Committee on the Future of the College” (hereafter cited as CFC report), p. 1.

2. Faculty members elected to the committee were Dorothy L. Bernstein, professor of mathematics; Noel J. J. Farley, associate professor of economics; and William L. Hedges, professor of English. The trustees were represented by H. Vernon Eney, Walter Sondheim, Jr., and Mary Frances P. Wagley; Mr. Eney was later replaced by H. Barksdale Brown, though Mr. Eney remained as counsel to the committee. The president appointed from the administration Dean Rhoda M. Dorsey, Dean of Students Martha A. Nichols, and Harry J. Casey, vice president-finance. Student members were Barbara J. Safriet ’69, president of the Students’ Organization for 1969–69, who was succeeded in her *ex officio* position by Lucretia M. Gibbs ’70, president of the Students’ Organization for 1969–70; Marilyn J. Morton ’70; Clare O’Connor ’70; and Marilyn Sternlicht ’69. Representing the alumnae were Emma Robertson Richardson ’34, Eleanor Rand Wilner ’59 (succeeded by Evelyn Dyke Schroedl ’62), and Winifred Leist Wilson ’43, alumnae director.

3. CFC report, p. 2.

4. This abbreviation for “Committee on the Future of the College” will be used throughout the rest of this chapter.

5. CFC report, p. 2; Exec. Comm. mins., September 22, 1969.

6. CFC report, pp. 5–6.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 10. In assessing the age of this particular perception of weakness, it is instructive to consider the following statement, which appeared in the 1888 *Prospectus* announcing the opening of The Woman’s College of Baltimore City: “The prevailing system is regarded as open to serious objection in requiring precisely the same amount of work to be done by all students, within the same time, under penalty of loss of class standing. This stimulates students of delicate constitution to over-exertion, and encourages older and maturer students from postponing graduation in order to pursue, at certain points, parallel and illustrative courses of reading.” Clearly, John B. Van Meter would have felt very much at home if he had had an opportunity to serve on the Subcommittee on the Academic Program in 1969.

8. *Ibid.*

9. *Ibid.*, p. 11.

10. *Ibid.*, p. 12.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 13. The term *relevance* irritated some members of the faculty because it had become an overused and rarely defined battlecry in contemporary discussions of educational matters. “Relevant to *what*?” was a question frequently asked by faculty members, many of whom considered queries about the educational relevance of music or history to be irrelevant, if not meaningless.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 17.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 14.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 16. (Once again, the College’s 1888 *Prospectus* comes to mind; the reader may also recall the student reactions to the 1934 New Plan, e.g., “I feel rather like a high school girl, having classes on the same subject on consecutive days.”)

15. Trustee mins., October 31, 1970.

16. *Ibid.*, October 25, 1969.

17. CFC report, p. 25.

18. *Ibid.*

19. Faculty mins., January 27, 1970.

20. *Ibid.*

21. CFC report, p. 28.

22. The list of January-term courses for 1971 included such offerings as

“Aggression and Ecology,” “Alexander the Great,” “Chemistry and Physics Applied: Nuts and Bolts of Contemporary Society,” “Classical Mythology,” “The Fairy Tale,” and “Gilbert and Sullivan.” The “Nuts and Bolts” course, as it was generally called, received national publicity and later became the basis of a book by Professors James L. A. Webb and Barton L. Houseman.

23. Thus the Faculty complied fully with the student petition it had received on May 10, 1969, except that it did not do so in time to benefit the class of 1969.

24. For purposes of carrying out President Perry’s directive three students and three faculty members joined the Subcommittee on the College as a Community, responsible for making recommendations concerning the governance of the College. The three additional students were Lucretia M. Gibbs ’70, just elected president of the Students’ Organization for 1969–70; Stephanie I. Thinglestad ’70, vice president of the Students’ Organization for 1969–70; and Susan M. Sachs ’72. The new faculty members were Jerome I. Cooperman, assistant professor of political science; Joseph Morton, assistant professor of philosophy; and Eli Velder, associate professor of education.

25. CFC report, pp. 59–60.

26. Trustee mins., January 27, 1973.

27. Exec. Comm. mins., September 17, 1973.

Chapter 15. Major Financial Problems: Reality versus Mirage

1. *Priorities for Action: Final Report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education*, p. 4.

2. Cheit, *The New Depression*, p. ix.

3. *Ibid.*, p. xi.

4. *Ibid.*, p. xviii.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 1. See also the two-page partial transcript and summary of a round-table discussion by eleven college presidents about their financial difficulties in the *New York Times*, July 13, 1970.

6. Cheit, *The New Depression*, p. 3. To think that Goucher’s size or reputation caused its problems is to disregard President Pusey’s report on Harvard for 1968–69, which announced that, in contrast to previous years, Harvard faced “a serious financial situation” (*ibid.*), not as serious as Goucher’s, but perhaps some solace to anyone who may have regarded this institution’s problems as unique or limited to small liberal arts colleges.

7. *Ibid.*, p. 10.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 11.

9. The enrollment decline is displayed in table 8.

10. Cheit, *The New Depression*, p. 6.

11. This list of income sources and areas of expenditure is by no means complete; for the sake of simplicity, only those categories that bear directly on the financial problems of the Perry administration are mentioned.

12. This situation was by no means unique to Goucher. According to David G. Healy, Goucher’s vice president for financial affairs since 1983, during the new depression *no* administration found itself able to foresee with even normal accuracy the financial response a year in advance, thanks to the magnitude of inflation.

13. Trustee mins., October 25, 1969.

14. Exec. Comm. mins., January 5, 1970.

15. *Ibid.*, November 6, 1972.

16. Trustee mins., October 28, 1967.

17. *Ibid.*, May 22, 1971.

18. As table 7 shows, it was actually more than three times the budgeted deficit.

19. Trustee mins., January 18, 1969.
20. *Ibid.*, May 24, 1969.
21. *Ibid.*, January 17, 1970.
22. Exec. Comm. mins., December 7, 1970.
23. *Ibid.*, March 22, 1971.
24. Some reductions were achieved through natural attrition and reduced hiring; like most colleges, Goucher regarded major faculty cuts as a last resort. Only when the risk of exhausting expendable endowment became too great for the trustees to tolerate did the College take the extreme step of terminating the positions of tenured faculty, but this point was not reached until shortly after the end of the Perry administration.
25. Exec. Comm. mins., October 12, 1970. The administration and the board had in fact anticipated this step but had chosen not to oppose it, on the grounds that such a development was inevitable in the long run and that graceful acceptance would encourage loyalty and diminish possible future loss of morale on the part of the staff.
26. Trustee mins., May 24, 1969.
27. *Ibid.*
28. The gifts had never been lavish; frequently they took the form of a book.
29. Exec. Comm. mins., November 6, 1972. President Perry had informed the Board of Trustees on May 20, 1972, that Vice President Harry Casey had resigned in order to devote himself to the growing of grapes for the future production of wine. He was later succeeded by Vice President Barnett.
30. More recent analyses seem to promise maximum efficiency when a campus houses either a smaller or a larger number than one thousand; today, with perfect hindsight, we can see that a goal somewhat lower than 1,000 might have been wiser.
31. Exec. Comm. mins., December 27, 1967.
32. *Ibid.*, January 4, 1971.
33. Trustee mins., May 24, 1969.
34. *Ibid.*, October 23, 1971.
35. *Ibid.*, October 25, 1969.
36. The reader may recall the following words from chapter 2: "The Faculty well knew that Goucher was not alone in its plight. According to President Robertson, fewer than forty colleges and universities had balanced their 1932–33 budgets without either reducing salaries or incurring a deficit, and Goucher was not one of the happy few."
37. Cuts did occur, but they came shortly after the conclusion of the Perry administration.
38. Faculty mins., November 10, 1971; Trustee mins., January 15, 1972.
39. Mr. Todd, who had recently died, bequeathed 40 percent of his residuary estate to the College; the Todds had already established the first fully endowed chair and had contributed, to date, over \$750,000.
40. Trustee mins., January 16, 1971.
41. At the end of the John Franklin Goucher administration (1890–1908) the College was in such desperate financial straits that President Goucher's successor, Eugene A. Noble (1908–11) resigned after three years, having proclaimed Goucher College "a financial experiment that has failed." As we have seen, Goucher was saved by President Guth, but went from a high point in the twenties in both enrollment and resources to near disaster during the depression. President Kraushaar profited from the academic prosperity of the fifties and early sixties to build the institution to new heights, but President Perry faced an economy in which a number of academic institutions perished.

1. *Weekly*, October 11, 1968.
2. Exec. Comm. mins., March 10, 1969.
3. *Ibid.*, September 8, 1969.
4. Trustee mins., October 25, 1969.
5. Exec. Comm. mins., September 25, 1967.
6. *Ibid.*, October 9, 1967.
7. Trustee mins., January 20, 1968.
8. One event worthy of celebration was the announcement that the Middle States Association had reaffirmed Goucher's accreditation without qualification (*ibid.*, May 20, 1968).
9. A model of the proposed building was eventually produced, but when it became apparent that sufficient funds to complete actual construction were not in prospect, the project was laid aside.
10. Exec. Comm. mins., October 26, 1970; Trustee mins., January 16, 1971.

Chapter 17. A New President Faces Old Challenges (1973–1979)

1. After graduating *magna cum laude* from Smith College, Dr. Dorsey earned B.A. and M.A. degrees from Newnham College, Cambridge, England, and the Ph.D. in history from the University of Minnesota. From there she came to Goucher as instructor in history in 1954, receiving promotions to the ranks of assistant professor in 1957, associate professor in 1962, and professor in 1965. From 1962 to 1965 she served as assistant dean, and in 1968 she was elected dean and vice president, a position she occupied until her appointment as acting president in 1973 and her election to the presidency in 1974.

2. Fac. mins., September 4, 1973.
3. Trustee mins., October 13, 1973.
4. The earlier objective had been to insure the safety of the invested funds at the expense of a smaller yield.
5. Fac. mins., October 17, 1973.
6. Exec. Comm. mins., November 20, 1973.
7. Trustee mins., February 16, 1974.
8. Curiously, this was exactly the amount of the first and *smallest* of the five Perry administration deficits (1968–69). In short, one more year with such a comparatively moderate deficit would exhaust the College's expendable endowment.

9. Trustee mins., October 19, 1974.
10. *Ibid.*, January 11, 1975.
11. Details of these curricular changes are discussed in chapter 19.
12. Exec. Comm. mins., February 17, 1975.
13. Fac. mins., February 19, 1975.
14. Exec. Comm. mins., April 21, 1975.
15. Professor Ingrid Y. Bucher (physics) moved to the Department of Mathematics in 1976, so only four tenured faculty members were actually terminated at this time.
16. Trustee mins., May 10, 1975.
17. *Ibid.*, October 23, 1976.
18. *Ibid.*, May 22, 1976.

19. Because some staff reductions occurred through natural attrition and non-reappointment of non-tenured faculty, the administration's problem was that of determining which tenured faculty would not be reappointed. Two of the five designated positions were in Classics, and since the Department of Classics itself was eliminated and because Professor Bucher was able to move from the

vacated position in Physics to one in Mathematics, the question of choice arose only in the fields of French and German.

20. The five criteria are mastery of subject, teaching excellence, evidence of research and/or creativity, service to the College, and professional service to the community.

21. Exec. Comm. mins., May 19, 1975.

22. Trustee mins., May 22, 1976. At the same meeting of the board, the Finance Committee announced its approval of an early retirement plan which would realize a saving for the College. Vice President Palmer outlined for the Executive Committee, on October 11, 1976, the plan allowing full-time faculty and professional staff to retire at age sixty-two with the same pension benefits they would have had if they had retired at age sixty-five. Projections indicated that the plan would result in substantial net savings to the College. The Executive Committee approved the proposal.

23. Ibid., October 23, 1976; January 15 and June 18, 1977; Exec. Comm. mins., February 7 and June 13, 1977.

24. Mr. Natunewicz's suit was based on a claim that he had no formal notification of his termination until November 1975, not having received an official letter on the subject by June 30. There was, however, evidence that he knew of his termination prior to June 30. (Exec. Comm. mins., November 22 and December 6, 1976.)

25. Ibid., June 13, 1977; Trustee mins., June 18, 1977.

26. Trustee mins., October 23, 1976.

27. Exec. Comm. mins., April 18, 1977.

28. Transcript of the Proceedings, United States District Court for the District of Maryland, *Hertha H. Krotkoff v. Goucher College*, Case No. 76-877-W (Civil Action), Baltimore, July 12, 1977, p. 1549.

29. Ibid., p. 1556.

30. Ibid., p. 1558.

31. Ibid., p. 1560–61.

32. Ibid., p. 1562.

33. Exec. Comm. mins., April 18, June 13, and July 26, 1977; October 23, 1978; Trustee mins., June 18 and October 8, 1977.

34. Exec. Comm. mins., February 7, 1977.

35. Ibid., January 3, 1978.

36. Trustee mins., June 7, 1978.

37. Ibid., February 16, 1974.

38. The Board of Trustees concurred on May 10, 1975.

39. Exec. Comm. mins., November 22, 1976; January 3, 1978.

40. Ibid., September 12, 1977.

41. Trustee mins., October 8, 1977; September 30, 1978; September 29, 1979.

42. Ibid., September 30, 1978; September 29, 1979.

43. Exec. Comm. mins., November 7, 1977. Professor Frederic O. Musser served on a part-time basis as assistant to the president from 1977 to 1980.

Chapter 18. Other Developments in the Life of the College (1973–1979)

1. Because curricular innovations were so extensive in the Dorsey years, they will be treated separately in chapter 19.

2. Trustee mins., April 15, 1974.

3. Exec. Comm. mins., December 1, 1975.

4. Trustee mins., October 23, 1976.

5. "Report of the Visiting Team of the Commission on Higher Education."

6. Exec. Comm. mins., January 7, 1974.

7. The same suggestion favoring faculty representation on the board was raised in another letter to Mr. DeVries, dated May 20, 1980, and signed by the chairmen of the three Faculties and Professor Brooke Peirce, chairman *pro tempore* of an unofficial faculty meeting which had requested that such a letter be sent. The trustee response remained unchanged.

8. Exec. Comm. mins., April 1, 1974.

9. *Ibid.*, October 23, 1978.

10. For full details on the buildings and their 1978 owners see table 3.

11. Exec. Comm. mins., April 23 and May 7, 1979.

12. *Weekly*, March 6, 1980.

13. In 1985 the *Weekly* staff decided to abandon the slash, even though the paper still appeared only twice a month, but later they concluded that a more distinctive name was called for, and *Weekly* became *The Quandecim*, the Latin word for fifteen, suggesting the number of days between issues.

14. Trustee mins., September 30, 1978.

15. Exec. Comm. mins., October 23, 1978; April 23, 1979. The health fee declined from \$75 in 1979–80 to \$60 in 1980–81.

16. Trustee mins., June 18, 1977.

17. *Outcry*, September 21, 1973.

18. Exec. Comm. mins., August 7, 1978.

19. Chapter 20 recounts the origin, development, and success of the Pearlstone Center.

20. That the echoes of 1970 had not totally died away is indicated by the students' view that the way to promote campus unity was to stage a protest. This time, at least, they seem to have been quite right.

21. *Weekly*, March 16, 1978.

22. *Ibid.*

23. *Ibid.*

Chapter 19. The Goucher Academic Program (1973–1985)

1. Minutes of the College Assembly (hereafter cited as Assem. mins.), March 10, 1975.

2. *Ibid.*

3. *Ibid.*

4. *Ibid.*

5. *Ibid.*

6. *Ibid.*, March 12, 1975.

7. Similar faculty fears had been expressed as early as 1917, when the education major, an obviously career-oriented program, first entered the Goucher curriculum.

8. Trustee mins., October 23, 1976.

9. Exec. Comm. mins., June 2, 1980. The 1980 committee was chaired by Professor Barton Houseman (chemistry) and included Professors Jean Baker (history), Virginia Dersch (sociology), William Johnson (biological sciences), Barry Knower (performing arts), Elaine Koppelman (mathematics), Wolfgang Thormann (modern languages), Eli Velder (education) and Fred White (English), as well as Barbara Boerner, director of admissions, and Edward Duggan, director of career development.

10. On February 9, 1980, Dean Billet had observed to the Board of Trustees that by 1995, high school graduations would be down 42 percent in New York State, 37 percent in Pennsylvania, 31 percent in Maryland, and 22 percent in Virginia. Trends differed in other parts of the country, but in Goucher's area of yield, projections showed a large decrease. Goucher's own projections showed a decline of 29 percent in the size of the freshman class between 1979–80 and

1990–91. The combined impact of high attrition (20 percent) and smaller entering classes meant that by 1990–91, the College would have 27 percent fewer students, a loss of 239. The administration projected a cumulative deficit of over \$20,000,000.

11. From approximately 1970 to 1985, in an effort to increase enrollments, admissions publications stressed the virtues of Goucher's being a college for women; prior to that time, proponents of the feminist position had not generally received strong support from the faculty as a whole.

12. Exec. Comm. mins., June 2, 1980.

13. The suggestion concerning freshman advising had already been addressed in 1978, when the first-year program was introduced; the second suggestion was implemented by Dr. Edward Duggan, director of career development since 1979, whose program makes important use of faculty advice.

14. The Strategic Plan, discussed in chapter 20, seems to indicate the trustees' sharing of the Academic Planning Committee's view.

15. Exec. Comm. mins., June 2, 1980.

16. *Ibid.*

17. *Ibid.*

18. "Report of the Academic Planning Committee," May 2, 1980.

19. Hedges, Cooperman, Koppelman, and Peirce to Dorsey and Billet, May 29, 1980.

20. Exec. Comm. mins., June 2, 1980.

21. Dorsey to Faculty, June 5, 1980.

22. Exec. Comm. mins., June 23, 1980.

23. A fifth tenured faculty member was given early retirement.

24. Trustee mins., June 13, 1981.

25. The American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges had jointly formulated the 1940 "Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure," a document endorsed by over one hundred other educational organizations and professional societies. The AAUP is the traditional body to which to appeal in cases involving alleged infringement of an individual's academic freedom.

26. Exec. Comm. mins., April 12, 1982. The AAUP Committee's report was published in the bulletin of the American Association of University Professors: "Academic Freedom and Tenure: Goucher College," pp. 13–23.

27. Trustee mins., June 18, 1983.

28. Assem. mins., March 20, 1980.

29. *Ibid.*, May 7, 1981.

30. The combination major began in 1931.

31. Trustee mins., January 17, 1976.

32. *Ibid.*, November 4, 1978.

33. *Ibid.*, September 30, 1978.

34. Exec. Comm. mins., July 27, 1982.

35. *Ibid.*, September 30, 1978.

36. Trustee mins., February 16 and October 19, 1974.

37. Exec. Comm. mins., July 26, 1977.

38. On June 17, 1978, President Dorsey announced to the Board of Trustees a new program, the Women's Management Development Project, financed by a grant from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The project, she said, would train twenty women with both a B.A. degree and volunteer experience for leadership capacity in management or supervisory level positions.

39. Trustee mins., February 17, 1979.

40. Exec. Comm. mins., October 8, 1979.

41. Trustee mins., October 11, 1980. Goucher II is, essentially, an updated version of the Wednesday Program for Continuing Education, which had begun under the leadership of Dean Elizabeth Geen in March, 1964; the Wednesday

Program was designed for women who had withdrawn from college without completing the requirements for the degree. It was seen as a preliminary step toward full enrollment in the College. The Wednesday program had been preceded by Alumnae Association noncredit programs in adult education dating from 1930.

42. The Post-Baccalaureate Premedical Program is designed for students who have completed a bachelor's and/or graduate degree but lack the majority of courses needed for entrance to medical school and other health professional schools. Seventeen students, twelve women and five men, entered the program in June, 1984, and three other students from the Goucher II program joined the class in September. The students, a majority of whom are Maryland residents, range in age from twenty-two to thirty-three years old.

43. I Thess. 5:21.

Chapter 20. *The End of the First Hundred Years (1980–1985)*

1. The campus later celebrated the good news by applauding Mrs. Harris as she painted up to the top the green thermometer in the College Center courtyard which had been registering the campaign's progress for many months.

2. Exec. Comm. mins., September 13, 1982.

3. Ibid., September 12, 1983.

4. "Report to the Governor's Commission on Excellence in Higher Education," p. 22.

5. Trustee mins., October 16, 1982.

6. Ibid., November 30, 1982.

7. Exec. Comm. mins., May 5, 1980.

8. President Dorsey also observed that she had spoken that morning with a group of students who, in sympathy with the workers, had been sitting-in overnight in her office.

9. Trustee mins., June 14, 1980.

10. Exec. Comm. mins., September 8, 1980.

11. Ibid., October 19, 1981.

12. Ibid., November 15, 1982.

13. Ibid.

14. Trustee mins., June 18, 1983.

15. Exec. Comm. mins., September 10, 1984.

16. Trustee mins., October 20, 1984.

17. Exec. Comm. mins., March 14, 1983.

18. Trustee mins., October 20, 1984.

19. Exec. Comm. mins., March 3, 1980.

20. Ibid., May 10, 1982. The organization of the centennial was the general responsibility of a steering committee, whose membership, in addition to Mrs. Nichols, included Pat Booker Dalton '58, national events chairman; Judith Brigstocke Hundertmark '54, local events chairman; Michele Manes Broadfoot '68, memorabilia chairman; Marilyn Southard Warshawsky '68, fund-raising chairman; Evelyn Dyke Schroedl '62, historical research and publications chairman; Marianne Ten Eyck, director of student activities/center, student events chairman; Rhoda M. Dorsey, president; Harry D. Gotwals, vice president for development and public relations; and Jean Horrigan, special projects coordinator. In addition to the committees chaired by these individuals, there was an Academic Program Committee with four subcommittees, one for each of the four centennial symposia presented during the year. While the work of most of the committees is reflected in the text of this chapter, that of the Historical Research and Publications Committee should also be noted: the Summer 1984 edition of the *Goucher Quarterly*, vol. 62, no. 4, was, in fact, the pictorial and

- Notes to Pages 242–251* verbal history of the first one hundred years of the College as developed by the committee and edited by Joan Abelson—a beautifully designed and colorful review of the historical highlights of Goucher's first century.
21. Bready, "Up, Up and Away! As Goucher Says Goodbye to Its First Century," p. A 14.
 22. Trustee mins., October 20, 1984.
 23. Exec. Comm. mins., April 8, 1985.
 24. A full account of the restoration process and the installation of the windows is found in an article by Carol Lindsley, "Tiffany at Goucher," in the Winter issue of the *Goucher Quarterly*, on pages 8–11.
 25. Ruby, "From Promise to Achievement," p. B 8.
 26. Ibid.

Afterword: The Transition to Coeducation

1. Assem. mins., May 1, 1986; Fac. mins., April 29, 1986.
2. Trustee mins., May 10, 1986.
3. "Report on Financing Alternatives."
4. Trustee mins., May 10, 1986.

B i b l i o g r a p h y

Unpublished Materials in Goucher College Archives

- Geen, Elizabeth. "Strengths and Weaknesses of the Goucher Curriculum," 1953.
- Kraushaar, Otto F. Untitled memoirs, 1982.
- Maryland Independent College and University Association, "Report to the Governor's Commission on Excellence in Higher Education."
- "Master Plan for the Towson Campus" [by Hideo Sasaki], 1958.
- Minutes of the Board of Trustees, Goucher College, 1930–85. Cited in notes as Trustee mins.
- Minutes of the College Assembly, Goucher College, 1970–85. Cited in notes as Assem. mins.
- Minutes of the Executive Committee, Board of Trustees, Goucher College, 1930–85. Cited in notes as Exec. Comm. mins.
- Minutes of the Faculty, Goucher College, 1930–85. Cited in notes as Fac. mins.
- "National Service, 1941–45." [Uncatalogued folder.]
- "Report of the Academic Planning Committee," May 2, 1980.
- "Report of the Committee on the Future of the College," September 1969.
- "Report of the Visiting Team of the Commission on Higher Education," Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, February 1978.
- "Report on Financing Alternatives," November 14, 1924, revised January 15, 1985.
- "Report on the Educational Program of the Upper Curriculum, 1959.
- Transcripts of oral interviews.

Published Materials

- "Academic Freedom and Tenure: Goucher College." *Academe* 69 (May–June 1983):13–23.
- Baker, Ray Stannard. *Woodrow Wilson, Life and Letters*, vol. 8. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Co., 1939.

- Bready, James H. "Up, Up and Away! As Goucher says Goodbye to Its First Century." Baltimore *Evening Sun*, September 12, 1984, p. A 14.
- Califano, Joseph A., Jr. *The Student Revolution: A Global Confrontation*. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1970.
- Cheit, Earl F. *The New Depression in Higher Education*. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971.
- Finn, Chester E., Jr. *Scholars, Dollars, and Bureaucrats*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1978.
- Fletcher, Joseph. *Situation Ethics, the New Morality*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1966.
- Goucher College Bulletin* III, 24, no. 2 (October, 1957).
- Goucher College Weekly* (1930-48).
- Goucher Weekly* (1948-73; 1975-85).
- Jencks, Christopher, and Riesman, David. *The Academic Revolution*. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Co., 1968.
- Knipp, Anna Heubeck, and Thomas, Thaddeus P. *The History of Goucher College*. Baltimore: Goucher College, 1938.
- Kraushaar, Otto F. "President Kraushaar Reports on 19 Years." Reprint. Towson, Md.: Goucher College Development Office, 1967.
- . "Report of the President 1958/60." *Goucher Alumnae Quarterly* 39, no. 2 (Winter 1961):30
- Lindsley, Carol. "Tiffany at Goucher." *Goucher Quarterly* 63, no. 2 (Winter 1985):8-11.
- Miles, Michael W. *The Radical Probe: The Logic of Student Rebellion*. New York: Athencum, 1973.
- Moment, Gairdner B. "Guth and Academic Freedom." *Goucher Quarterly* 62, no. 4 (Summer 1984):12-13.
- Obear, Frederick W. "Student Activism in the Sixties." In *Protest! Student Activism in America*, edited by Julian Foster and Durward Long. New York: William Morrow and Co., 1970.
- Outcry* (1973-75).
- Priorities for Action: Final Report of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1973.
- Ruby, Michael. "From Promise to Achievement." Baltimore *Messenger*, January 1985, p. B 8.
- United States Code*, Title X, sec. 1001f, Public Law 85-864.
- United States District Court for the District of Maryland. Transcript of Proceedings, *Krotkoff v. Goucher College*, Case no. 76-877-W (Civil Action). Baltimore: July 12, 1977.
- Wolk, Ronald A. "Federal Government and Higher Education." In *The Encyclopedia of Education*, vol. 3, edited by Lee C. Deighton. New York: Macmillan Co. and Free Press, 1971.

I n d e x

- Abelson, Joan, 281n.20
- Academic distinction, 9, 17, 110-11
- Academic Planning Committee (faculty), 217-21. *See also* Personnel, reduction in
- Academic programs. *See* College teacher preparatory program; Computer science program; Continuing education programs; Curriculum; Elementary teacher education programs; Graduate programs; Non-Western Studies program; Second bachelor's degree program; Study abroad programs
- Academic reorganization, committee on, 10
- Acheson, Dean, 142
- Activism, student: at Goucher, 111, 140, 151, 152, 154-60, 175-76; outside Goucher, xii-xiii, 149-54
- Admissions: with advanced standing, 9; committee on, 13; director of, 13; student, 9, 13, 43, 101-3, 125-27
- Adult education. *See* Continuing education programs
- Adult education committee (alumnae), 113, 255n.28, 268n.34
- Advising, student. *See* First year program; Guidance officers
- Aksyonov, Vassily, 241
- Albritton, Sherrod, 113
- Alcock, John, 253n.3
- Alcock House, 253n.3, 262n.20
- Alfheim Hall, 46, 262n.20
- Almae matri*, 139
- Alumnae: in Dorsey years, 205, 233, 245-46, 250; in Kraushaar years, 61-62, 69, 75, 80, 118-20, 269n.1; in Perry years, 186; in Robertson years, 6-7, 30-31, 48
- Alumnae Association, 31, 76, 113, 118-20, 121, 225n.28, 268n.34
- Alumnae Club, Baltimore, 49
- Alumnae Council, 30-31
- Alumnae Fund, 22, 118-20, 186, 238, 240
- Alumnae Gift Building Fund, 48, 61-62, 69, 119
- Alumnae House, 75-76, 119
- Alumnae House Building Committee, 75
- Alumnae Lodge, 45, 119
- American Association of University Professors (AAUP), 122, 203, 222, 254n.7, 280n.25; Goucher chapter of, 19, 200
- American Council on Education, 19, 203
- American Institute of Architects, 31; Baltimore chapter of, 81
- Anderson, Gail, 157, 273n.30
- Andrews, Mary E., 96
- Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, 181, 227-28
- Angelou, Maya, 243
- Anna Heubeck Hall, 47, 60, 75, 77-79, 260n.2, 262n.21
- Anti-war movement activities: demonstrations in Washington, 151, 152, 153-54, 157-58; moratorium on Vietnam war, 157-58; student strike, 153-54, 158. *See also* Baltimore Four, trial of

Architects, Advisory Board of, 24, 29, 31-32, 62, 79, 80

Architectural competition, 31-32

Architecture of Towson campus. *See* Campus, Towson, Master Plan; and *names of individual buildings*

Art department, 9, 19, 79-80, 93-94, 244

Arts and Ideas course, 233

Art Therapy program, 230

Association of American Colleges, 203

Auden, W. H., 142

Bacon, Clara L., 44, 97, 262n.21

Bacon House, 84, 97, 98, 262n.21

Baker, Jean H., 97, 279n.9

Baker, Mary (Mrs. William G.), 121

Baldwin, Summerfield, 240, 262n.21

Baldwin House, 240, 262n.21

Ball, George, 243

Baltimore Association of Commerce, 81

Baltimore beltway, 47, 89-90

Baltimore campus. *See* Campus, city

Baltimore County Zoning Commission, 48-49

Baltimore Evening Sun, 129

Baltimore Four, trial of, 154

Baltimore Museum of Art, 113

Baltimore Sun, 202

Barn, 77, 141, 261n.3

Barnett, Robert H., 184

Barton, Volia P., 99

Barzun, Jacques, 142

Beardsley, Grace, 37

Beardsley, Wilford A., 95

Beatty, J. M., Jr., 29, 94; "Builders of Greater Goucher," 29; "In Memoriam," 29

Belford, Fontaine, 230

Belluschi, Pietro, 80, 261n.4, 264n.25

Bennett, Benjamin F., 259n.32

Bennett, Eleanor A., 259n.32

Bennett Hall, 24, 48, 259n.32, 265n.51

Bennett House, 47, 75, 259n.32, 265n.51

Bequests to College, 120. *See also names of individual donors*

Berlinrood, Martin, 223, 241

Bernstein, Dorothy L., 98, 114, 274n.2

Billet, James, 208, 241; on academic program, 215-17, 227-28, 230; and faculty reductions, 199-200, 202, 203, 221

Biological Sciences department, 9, 98-99, 200. *See also* Physiology and Hygiene department

Black student, first admitted, 126

Black Students' Association, 159

Blanchard, Rae, 95

Board of Control, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 254n.1

Board of Instruction, 9, 10, 12, 254n.1

Board of Overseers, 71, 192

Board of Trustees. *See* Trustee actions

Boerner, Barbara, 279n.9

Bond, Chrystelle T., 94

Bonnefoux, Jean-Pierre, 245

Borries, Eline von, 24, 83-84, 100, 265n.53

Boulanger, Nadia, 142

Bowman, Ethel, 99

Bradford, Jean, 99

Braunlich, Alice F., 95

Bready, James H., 242

Brinkley, Roberta F., 95

Broadfoot, Michele M., 281n.20

"Broadsides," 42

Browder, Earl, 28

Brown, H. Barksdale, 274n.2

Brown, Hilton, 94

Brune, Frederick W., 38

Bryant, Catherine, 213-14

Brzezinski, Zbigniew, 142

Bucher, Ingrid Y., 277n.15

Buchner, Louisa W., 245

Budget, college: absence of before 1930, 254n.9; attempts to balance, 37, 186, 205-6, 219; creation of, 177-79, 180-81, 197-202; first at Goucher, 21; recommended by President Robertson, 6

"Builders of Greater Goucher" (J. M. Beatty, Jr.), 29

Buildings. *See* Campus, city; Campus, Towson

Bunting, George F., Jr., 235-36

Business officer, Mrs. Guth as, 6

Bussey, Gertrude, 27, 50, 96, 133

Calendar, academic, xiii, 9, 14, 17, 164-66. *See also* January term

Calvert Prize, 210

Campaign for Human Resources, 185-87, 192, 205

Campaign for Women of Promise, 206, 233

Campaigns. *See* Campaign for Human Resources; Campaign for Women of Promise; 50th Anniversary Campaign; "4-2-1" Campaign; 1950 campaign; 75th Anniversary Campaign

Campus, city, 5, 45, 48, 59, 85-87. *See also* Land, sale or lease of; and *names of individual buildings*

Campus, Towson: architecture of, 24, 29-30, 31-32, 67-68, 69-70; entrance road to, 47, 76, 266n.8; in Guth-Robertson years, 5, 7, 23, 24, 33, 44, 46-48; in Kraushaar years, 59-60, 67-85, 88-91; Master Plan, 68, 88; Sasaki revision of Master Plan, 80, 88, 91. *See also* Architectural competition; and *names of individual buildings*

Campus Hills housing development, 89

Canfield, Virginia, 95, 114

- Carnegie Corporation, 228
 Carnegie reports: *Changing Practices in Undergraduate Education*, xiv; *Priorities in Action*, 174
 Carpenter, Ethel S., 5-6
 Carroll, Mollie R., 97
 Casey, Harry J., Jr., 121, 122, 130, 269n.7, 274n.2, 276n.29; on financial crisis, 182, 185, 186
 Catherine Hooper Hall, 141
 Centennial celebration: dedication of Tiffany window during, 243-44; final weekend of, 245; footrace, 244; nationwide activities related to, 244; opening convocation of, 242-43; picnic, 242; planning for, 242; scholarships, 243; symposia, 243, 412-14; tea, 244; television coverage of, 242
 Chamberlain, John V., 96
 Channels, 155
 Chapel, Haebler Memorial, 75, 81-82
 Chapel organ, 82
 Chaplain's sex sermon, 129-31
 Chapman, Gretel, 94, 222
 Charles E. Merrill Trust, 113
 Charter, College, 9
 Chase, Mary Ellen, 142
 Cheit, Earl, xiv, 174-76
 Chemistry Club, 212-13
 Chemistry department, 9, 99
 Chiang Kai-Shek, Madame, 44
 Chicago, University of, x, xi, xii, 103
 Cicone, Judge Frank E., 203
 City College of New York, 140
 Civilian Production Administration, 47
 Classics department, 95, 200-201, 202
 Cleland, Ralph E., 98
 Cochrane, Stephenson and Wing (architects), 83
 Cockey, Ethel, 118
 Code of Conduct, 159
 Coeducation, 170-73, 247-51
 College Assembly: creation of, 155, 160, 169-70; curricular changes approved by, 215-17, 224-27, 228-30; vote of, on coeducation, 171, 172, 247
 "College Bowl" (CBS-TV), 140, 191
 College Center, 75, 80-81, 141, 239
 College Council, 5, 27, 35
 College teacher preparatory program, 114-16
 Collier-Adams, Julie, 208
 Columbia University, contemporary civilization course of, x, xii
 Combination major, 19, 227
 Commencement exercises, 44, 139-140
 Committee on the Future of the College, xiii-xiv, xvi, 154, 161-173
 Committees, faculty, 12, 19. *See also names of individual committees*
 Communication department, 97, 218
 Comprehensive examinations, 14, 18, 154, 155-57, 168
 Compton, Carl T., 142
 Computer science program, 218
 Computing, academic, 114, 225, 228, 240
 Conant, James Bryant, 142
 Conner, Frances R., 50, 82, 134, 185 256n.47
 Conner House, 82
 Continuing education programs, 20-21, 113-14, 230-31
 Coon, Geraldine A., 98
 Cooperman, Jerome I., 97, 221, 275n.24
 Copland, Aaron, 142
 Corbeau, Andre, 97
 Core course, 222
 Corner, Eleanor D., 31, 113, 255n.28
 Corrin, Brownlee S., 97, 113, 241, 269n.7
 Course credits, 17, 228-29
 Course evaluation system, 193
 Court decisions, 38, 203-4
 Crane, Esther, 35, 97, 103
 Crittenden, Phoebe J., 99
 Crocker, Lester G., 95
 Crooks, Esther J., 95
 Cryptography, war-time course in, 40
 Curriculum: in 1934, ix-xii, 6, 9, 12-21, 64-65, 103-4; in 1958, xii, 92, 104-117; in 1970, xii-xiv, 161-64, 166-68; in 1975-81, xiv-xvi, 215-232
 Curriculum Committee, 5, 14, 107, 109-10, 113-14, 156
 Curtis, Eugene N., 10, 96
 Dad's Day, 138
 Dalsheimer, Mr. and Mrs. Hugo, 121
 Dalton, Pat B., 281n.20
 Dance department, 12, 94, 243
 Dance/Movement Therapy program, 229-30
 Dartmouth College, x
 David Allan Robertson Wing (Julia Rogers Library), 84, 184
 Davis, Francis A., 59, 77, 89
 Debate team, 26
 DeChiaro, Ralph, 89, 90, 240
 Decker Center for Information Technology, 240. *See also* Computing, academic
 deFord, Sara, 95
 Degree requirements: in 1934 curriculum, 16-19, 103-4; in 1958 curriculum, 107-8; in 1970 curriculum, 166-68; in 1975-81 curriculum, 223-27
 Degrees, honorary, 32, 44, 50, 191-92
 Delaware, University of, 34-35
 Departments, academic, 9-10. *See also names of individual departments*
 Depression, effects of, 21-23, 30, 174-88
 Dersch, Virginia, 279n.9
 Desegregation, racial, 125-27, 140, 151

- Development Committee (trustee), 178, 185
- Development plan, ten-year, 67, 68
- DeVries, Donald, 206, 221–22
- Dewey, John, x
- Dewey, Thomas E., 137–38
- Dilettante*, 35, 137
- Disheroon, Leslie, 233–240
- Dismissals, faculty, 11–12, 37, 209
- Divisions of curriculum: lower, xi, 14–17, 103–8; upper, xi, 14–15, 108–11
- Dodson, Helen, 263n.26
- Donald Hammond Associates, 69
- Donaldson, John K., Jr., 202–3
- Donnybrook, 90
- Donnybrook Fair, 138
- Dorothy Stimson Hall, 79, 82–83, 184, 239, 260n.2
- Dorsey, Rhoda M., 57, 114, 115, 140, 156, 274n.2, 277n.1; on American Association of University Professors censure, 222; and Centennial celebration, 242, 245–46, 281n.20; and coeducation decision, 247, 250, 251; on energy, 204; and enrollments, 205, 234; and faculty terminations, 199–201, 202, 203, 221, 222; on finances, 204, 235; on James Billet, 241; and Middle States evaluation, 208; positions held by, 96, 191, 192–93, 197, 207–8, 260n.58, 269n.7, 274n.2; and strategic plan, 236; and students, 214, 241; and Tiffany window, 244; and workers' strike, 237
- Double major, 227
- Dowell, George B., 94
- Downtown campus. *See* Campus, city
- Duggan, Edward, 279n.9, 280n.13
- Dulaney, Henry S., 262n.21
- Dulaney House, 262n.21
- Dulaney Valley Road, 59–60, 90, 240–41
- Dunnock House, 45
- Earhart, Amelia, 26
- Early admissions program, 101–3
- Eastern High School (Baltimore), 101
- Ebeling, Hermann, 95
- Echo*, 155
- Economics departments: Economics and Management, 97, 218; Economics and Sociology, 9, 20–21
- Educational Facilities Laboratories, 83
- Education department, 9, 97, 200; graduate program of, in elementary teacher education, 103, 229; undergraduate program of, in elementary teacher education, 103
- Ehrlich, Sibylle, 95
- Eight objectives, x–xi, 9, 15–17, 18, 64, 106
- Eisenhower, Dwight D., 138
- Elderkin, Clarence, 77
- Elementary teacher education programs: undergraduate, 103; graduate, 103, 229
- Eline von Borries Swimming Pool, 83–84
- Elizabeth B. and David A. Robertson Lectureship, 141
- Elmore B. Jeffery Lectures, 141
- E Longinquo*, 139
- Endowment: expendable, nearing exhaustion, 199, 201–2, 219; expendable, need to increase, 184–85, 205, 206; expendable, need to use, 176, 186; increased by President Guth, 5; invested in dormitories, 37–38; President Kraushaar's concern about, 61; problems with use of, 37–38
- Energy Resources Management Company (ThERM), 205
- Eney, H. Vernon, 87, 89, 127, 128, 184–85, 203, 274n.2
- English department, 9, 19, 20, 94–95, 200
- Enrollment: in Dorsey years, 197–99, 200, 201, 205, 215, 218, 234, 279n.10; in Guth-Robertson years, 5, 21–22, 23, 34, 37, 45, 46, 256n.39; in Kraushaar years, 63, 79; in Perry years, 170, 175, 179–80. *See also* Finances, college
- Equal Rights Council, 35
- Executive Committee, Board of Trustees. *See* Trustee actions
- Executive Council. *See* President's Council
- Faculties I, II, and III, 12
- Faculty awards (trustee), 210–11
- Faculty Club, 21–22
- Faculty: appointments, 10–11, 101; housing, 48, 62, 91, 260n.3; promotions, 12, 81, 181, 255n.31
- Faculty (instructional): in Dorsey years, 209–10, 221, 250; in Guth-Robertson years, 5, 21–23, 27; in Kraushaar years, 63, 92–101, 105; in Perry years, 154, 190–91, 193–94
- Faculty (legislative body): in Dorsey years, 200, 210, 236, 247; in Kraushaar years, 110–11, 112, 114; in Perry years, 155, 158, 162–63, 165–68, 169–70, 171–72, 193; in Robertson years, 10–14, 17, 27–28, 40
- Faculty Personnel Policies Committee (trustee), 200, 209
- Faculty Planning Committee. *See* Planning Committee, faculty
- Faculty Review Committee, 200, 201, 202. *See also* Personnel, reduction in
- Falk Foundation, 113
- Farley, Noel J. J., 97, 274n.1

- Federal Educational Facilities grant, 84
Fensal Hall, 45, 48
Field Politics Center, Hughes, 97, 113,
50th Anniversary Campaign, 24, 30–31,
33–34
50th Anniversary celebration, 23, 32
Finances, college: addressed by President
Robertson, 6; effect of depression on,
21; effect of energy on, 204–5; effect
of, on 1973 coeducation debate, 170,
171; effect of voluntary faculty salary
cut on, 22–23; exigency of, 199, 222;
overview of, 174–88; President
Kraushaar on, 61–63, 64; resulting in
deficits, surpluses, and debt, 25, 45–
46, 197–202, 204–6, 215–16. *See also* Bequests to College; Budget, col-
lege; Depression, effects of; Endow-
ment; Enrollment; Financial exigency;
Fund-raising; Land, sale or lease of;
Salaries and wages, faculty and staff;
Tuition and fees, increases in; *and*
*names of individual campaigns and do-
nors*
- Financial aid, 183, 234–35
Fine arts building, 91
Fine arts. *See* Art department
First year program, 212
Fiske, Josephine, 100
Fitzhugh, Elizabeth R., 97
Fitzpatrick, Blanche, 97
Folkvang Hall, 45
Foote, George, 97
Ford Foundation, 115–16, 122, 185. *See also* Fund for Adult Education; Fund
for the Advancement of Education
Foreign study. *See* Study abroad pro-
grams
Foster House, 27, 38, 45
“4-2-1” Campaign, 5, 7, 31
Frank, Judge Eli, 38
Frankl, Viktor, 142
Free elective system (Harvard), x
Frehafer, Katherine, 99
French. *See* Modern Languages depart-
ment
Freshman seminars, 115, 167–68
Friends of the Library, 71, 119
Froelicher, Frances M., 44, 262n.21
Froelicher, Hans, 5, 11, 24, 93, 253n.6,
262n.21, 266n.1
Froelicher Hall, 69–70, 184, 260n.2,
262nn. 20, 21, 263n.2
Frost, Robert, 142
Frost and Frost (architects), 32
Fund for Adult Education, 123–24
Fund for the Advancement of Education,
101–3, 104
Fund-raising, 62–63, 65, 68, 69, 120–
122. *See also* Alumnae Fund; Alumnae
Gift Building Fund; Depression, effects
of; Finances, college; Goucher College
Fund; Land, sale or lease of; *and*
*names of campaigns and individual do-
nors of bequests, gifts, and grants*
Funk, Helen B., 99, 269n.7
- Gairdner Moment Wing (Hoffberger Sci-
ence Building), 99, 238
Galbraith, John Kenneth, 142, 238
Galkin, Elliott W., 94, 113, 269n.7
Gallagher, Katherine J., 96, 263n.2
Gallagher House, 263n.2
Gamble, James N., 78
Gamble House, 78
Gateway, William W. Guth Memorial,
46, 59–60, 77
Geen, Elizabeth: on academic program,
80, 106; career of, 95, 103, 191, 192,
260n.58, 267n.9, 268n.27
Gemwell, Edgar, 185
General education, x–xii, xiv–xvi, 14–
15, 64–65, 103–8. *See also* Arts and
Ideas course; Core course; Eight objec-
tives; Freshman seminars
General Education in a Free Society
 (“Harvard Red Book”), xi–xii, 64–65
German department, 9. *See also* Modern
Languages department
German Language Institute, 112
Gibbs, Lucretia M., 157, 274n.2,
275n.24
Gifted and Talented Program in the Arts,
231
G-I-G (Get-into-Goucher) Day, 241–42
Gimle Annex, 45
Gimle Hall, 45, 85
Githens, Marianne, 97
“Give-or-Get-for-Goucher” Campaign.
See “4-2-1” Campaign.
Glass, H. Bentley, 98
Glee Club, 26
Goddard, Eunice R. 95
Goldman, Patricia, 247, 249, 269n.2
Gonzaga University, 191
Goodhue, Bertram G., 29–30
Goodloe, James F., 95
“Good Morning America” (ABC-TV),
242
Gotwals, Harry D., 281n.20
Goucher, John F., 43, 87
Goucher, Mary Cecelia F., 44, 243
Goucher Boulevard, 90
Goucher Center for Continuing Studies,
114, 230–31
Goucher College Fund, 37
Goucher College Weekly: *See Weekly*.
Goucher College
Goucher Committee to Defend America
by Aiding the Allies, 39
Goucher Defense Organization, 39
Goucher Hall, 32, 45, 59, 61
Goucher House, 62, 87, 119, 265n.1
Goucher Plan. *See* Curriculum: in 1934

- Goucher II program, 114, 231, 280n.41
Goucher Victory, 43
 Governance, College: in Perry years, 168–70, 190; in Robertson years, 5–6, 10–11, 12
 Government aid to education, 127–28
 Grading system, xiii, 154, 228
 Graduate programs: in art therapy, 218, 230; in dance/movement therapy, 229–30; in elementary education, 103, 229, 266n.7
 “Great Books” approach to education, ix, xi–xii, xv
 Greater Goucher. *See* Campus, Towson
 Greek department, 9. *See also* Classics department
 Greenhouse, 213
 Greif, Alice F., 269n.7
 Greif, Ann, 241
 Grievance Committee, 12, 200, 202, 209, 210
 Groom’s House, 76
 Guenther Brewing Company, 49
 Guidance officers, 16
 Guth, Helen L. (Mrs. William W.), 6, 46, 77, 262n.21
 Guth, William W., 4–6, 11, 29–30, 46, 253nn. 5, 6, 262n.21
 Gymnasium. *See* Lilian Welsh Gymnasium

 Habermann, Helen M., 99, 115
 Haebler, daughters of Mr. and Mrs. William T., 82, 121
 Haebler, Mrs. William T., 76, 79, 82
 Haebler Memorial Chapel, 75, 81–82
 Haile, Edmund F., 236, 238–40
 Hammond, Donald, 71. *See also* Donald Hammond Associates
 Hampton, Charlotte T., 263n.2
 Harris, Janet J., 206, 233, 269n.7, 281n.1
 Harry A. Hudgins Company, 37, 38
 Harvard University, xi–xii, 64–65
 Hawes, Raymond P., 96
 Health Center, 44, 73, 82, 84, 212, 264n.39
 Hecht’s department store, 33
 Hedges, William L., 95, 221, 274n.2
 Henry, John, 192–93, 205, 208
 Henry and Ruth Blaustein Rosenberg Lectureship in Music, 142
 Herberg, Will, 142
 Hesky, Mary Taylor, 241
 Hester Wagner House, 82
 Heubeck Hall. *See* Anna Heubeck Hall
 High Point College, 191
 History department, 9, 20, 50, 96–97
History of Goucher College (Knipp and Thomas), 3, 12

 Hobbs, Clark S.: appointed vice president, 50; and land sale negotiations, 48, 88; prepared development plan, 67–68; prepared for Kraushaars’ arrival, 48, 60, 62
 Hodge, Mary A., 98
 Hoffberger, Samuel, 72
 Hoffberger family, 49, 72–73, 263n.23, 263n.27
 Hoffberger Science Building, 47–48, 60, 72–73, 81, 238, 263nn. 26, 27
 Honors, academic. *See* Academic distinction
 Honors Committee, 110–11
 Hooper, Lulie P., 262n.21
 Hooper House, 262n.21
 Hoover, Herbert, 26–27
 Hopkins, Annette B., 95
 Hopkins, William H., 139
 Horn, David, 99
 Horning, Marjorie, 212
 Horrigan, Jean, 281n.20
 Houseman, Barton L., 99, 228, 274n.22, 279n.9
 Housing and Home Finance Agency, 127
 Howard S. Nulton Lecture Fund, 142
 Howe, Florence, 114
 Hughes, Harry, 210, 242–43
 Hughes, Sarah T., 120, 244, 269n.2
 Hughes Center, 97, 113
 Humanities building. *See* Van Meter Hall
Human Values in the Emerging American City, 123, 124
 Hundertmark, Judith B., 281n.20
 Hunner House, 45, 85
 Hutzler, Albert, 48
 Hutzler’s department store, 33, 49, 59, 89
 Huxtable, Ada Louise, 243

 Independent work, 17, 110–11
 Infirmary Auxiliary, 27
 “In Memoriam” (J. M. Beatty, Jr.), 29
 Institute for secondary school teachers of modern languages, 112
 Institute in economics and sociology, 112
 Integrative exercise, 157, 168, 223
 Intellectual Country Fair, 112, 119
 Interinstitutional exchange program, 113, 193
 International relations, 19–20
 Internships, off-campus, 40–42, 225
 Italian. *See* Modern Languages department

 Jack H. Pearlstone, Jr., Charitable Trust, 239
 Jack Pearlstone Student Center, 213, 239, 240
 Jane and Robert Meyerhoff Lectureship, 238

- January term, xiii, 164–66, 167, 225, 274n.22
- Jarrell, Randall, 142
- Jeffery, Elmore B., 31, 78
- Jeffery House, 31, 78
- Jeffrey, Julie Roy, 97, 248–51
- John Franklin Goucher Medal, 83
- Johns Hopkins University, 80, 113, 171–73
- Johns Hopkins University School of Hygiene and Public Health, 228
- Johnson, Lincoln F., 93, 114
- Johnson, William S., 279n.9
- Joint Economic Council Workshop, 112
- Jones, John Price, 69
- Jones, Sarah D., 95
- Jordan, June, 243
- Julia Rogers Library, 47, 48, 61, 68–69, 70–71, 84, 103–4
- Kalends*, 35, 136–7
- Kaufman, Frank, 269n.7
- K-Day, 143
- Kelley, Louise, 50, 84, 98, 99, 260n.58
- Kelley Lecture Hall, 84
- Kennedy, Robert F., 154
- Kentucky, University of, 140
- Kerr, Clark, 174–75
- Ketchum, Inc., 206
- King, Jessie L., 98
- King, Martin Luther, Jr., 154
- Kirk, Harris E., 96
- Kistiakowsky, Vera, 243
- Knipp, Anna H., 3, 12, 78
- Knower, Barry, 94, 279n.9
- Koppelman, Elaine, 98, 221, 279n.9
- Kraushaar, Otto F., 50, 57–66, 81, 121, 143, 191–92, 242; and academic program, xii, 64–65, 80, 103–4, 112–13; and alumnae, 61–62, 66, 69, 80, 118–19; on architecture, 67–68; on Barn, 77; and bequest program, 120; on building campus, 67, 72–73, 75; on city campus, 85–87; on college move, 62–63, 65; on crises, 125–31; and cultural events, 140–42; and early admissions; 102–3; and enrollments, 63; on faculty, 63; and faculty salaries, 100; and finances, 61, 63, 64, 65, 67, 69; and Ford Foundation grant, 122; and library, 48, 68–69, 70–71; and 1950 campaign, 69; period, 189; and physical education program, 83–84, 265n.53; on President Robertson, 63–65; residences of, 48, 62, 79; and 75th anniversary 123–24; and students, 65–66, 74, 101, 132–137, 259n.56; and trustees, 61–63
- Kraushaar Auditorium, 81, 141. *See also* College Center
- Kresge, Sebastian, 72–73, 263n.23
- Kresge Foundation, 72–73, 263nn. 23, 24
- Krotkoff, Hertha, 202, 203–4
- Krugman, Carol L., 273n.27
- Lacy, Ann M., 99
- Lahey, Richard, 94
- Lancaster, R. Kent, 97
- Land, sale or lease of: in Dorsey years, 240–41; in Kraushaar years, 89; in Perry years, 185; in Robertson years, 33, 38, 45, 48–49
- Land Development Committee, 87, 185
- Landon, Alfred, 28
- Lang, George F., 82
- Lang, Marian Gift, 82
- Langdon, Ladema M., 98
- Language Laboratory, 11, 21, 80, 239
- Latin department, 10. *See also* Classics department
- Latzer, Cora O., 239
- Latzer Room, 239
- Lectureships, endowed, 141–42. *See also* names of individual lectureships
- Lemmi, Charles W., 95, 255n.29
- Lentulay, Rudy J., 95
- Levels of difficulty in curriculum, xii, 109, 111
- Lewand, Robert E., 98
- Lewis, Florence P., 97, 263n.26
- Lewis, Grace T., 82
- Lewis, Robert H., 94, 113
- Lewis House, 82
- Lewis Telescope, 98, 263n.26
- Liberty ship *John F. Goucher*, 43
- Library. *See* Julia Rogers Library
- Library (city campus), 5, 17, 28, 103–4
- Lilian Welsh Gymnasium, 72–73, 77, 141, 263n.27
- Lilian Welsh Laboratory, 47–48, 263n.27. *See also* Hoffberger Science Building
- Litigation involving College, 203–4
- Lloyd, Howard H., 99
- Long, Barbara, 99
- Long, Howard, 266n.7
- Longley, William H., 98
- Lonn, Ella, 96
- Louise Kelley Lecture Hall, 84
- Louisiana State University, 191
- Lowell, Robert, 142
- Lowenfish, Lee, 156
- Loyola College, 193
- Ludlington Airplane Line, 26
- Luetkemeyer, John, 89, 121, 122, 128
- Lyons, William T., Inc., 263n.27
- McCarthy, Eugene, 154
- McCarty, Stella A., 44, 97
- McCasland, S. Vernon, 96
- McCormick Company, 49, 240

- McCullers, Carson, 142
 McCurley, Mary T., 5, 118
 McDougle, Ivan E., 51, 97
 McHale, Kathryn, 97
 McKim, Mead and White (architects), 87
 MacLeish, Archibald, 142
 Major concentration, 19–20, 21, 109–110. *See also* Combination major;
 Double major
 Management program, 218
 Mardal House, 45
 Marechaux, Genevieve, 195
 Marts and Lundy, Inc., 120
 Mary Fisher Hall: in Kraushaar years, 60, 73, 80, 262n.21, 263n.25; in Perry years, 184; in Robertson years, 33–34, 37, 38–39, 44, 45, 48, 260n.2
 Maryland, State of, 186, 239
 Maryland Historical Trust, 210
 Maryland Independent College and University Association (MICUA), 234–35
 Maryland State Roads Commission, 47, 89–90
 Master of Arts degree programs: in art therapy, 230; in dance/movement therapy, 229–30
 Master of Education degree program, 103, 229
 Master of Public Health program, 226
 Mathematics department, 10, 19, 97, 200
 Matilla, Alfredo, 156
 Mattfeld, Jacqueline, 235
 May Ball, 35
 May Fair, 271n.2
 Mead, Margaret, 142
 Mellon Foundation. *See* Andrew W. Mellon Foundation
 Memorials, committee on, 44
 Methodist Episcopal Church, Baltimore Conference of, 32
 Meyerhoff, Jane, 238
 Meyerhoff, Robert, 238
 Meyerhoff Lectureship, 238, 241
 Middle States Association, 51, 108, 208–9, 260n.60
 Midgard Hall, 45
 Miller, Anna L., 95
 Minnesota, University of, 140
 Modern Languages department, 21, 80, 95, 200, 201, 255n.29, 264n.22, 266n.1
 Moment, Gairdner B., 98, 238
 Moore, Marianne, 142
 Moore and Hutchins (architects): President Kraushaar on, 61, 67–68; as winners of national architectural competition, 32
 Morale: community, 5, 34, 45, 46; faculty, 3, 5, 12, 17, 18, 63, 149, 187, 209; student, 3, 4–5, 17, 19, 74
 Morgan State College, 193
 Morrell, Jane, 97
 Morris, Walter M., 96, 193
 Morton, Joseph, 96, 275n.24
 Morton, Marilyn, 274n.2
 Motz, John, 89
 Moving of campus: in Kraushaar years, 60, 62–63, 65, 67, 68, 261n.8; in Robertson years, 30–31, 44–48
 Mueller, William R., 95
 Muller, Stephen, xv
 Mulligan, Addison E., 121
 Munns, Lawrence Kay, 97, 113, 223
 Murray, Florence, 43
 Music department, 21, 94, 243
 Musser, Frederic O., 95, 208
 Muuss, Rolf, 97
 National Defense Education Act (NDEA), 112, 128–29, 270n.11
 National Institutes of Health (NIH), 81
 National Labor Relations Board (NLRB), 236–37
 National Register of Historic Places, 85
 National Science Foundation (NSF), 112, 114, 228
 National Service Program (Goucher), 39, 40
 Natunewicz, Chester F., 202, 203, 278n.24
 Navy, U.S., 40
 Newman, Katharine, 223
 Newmann, William L., 97, 193
 New Plan. *See* Curriculum: in 1934
 Newspaper, student. *See* *Echo*; *Outcry*; *Quindecim*; *Weekly*; *Goucher College New York Times*, 129
 Nichols, Martha A.: on admissions standards, 125; and Centennial celebration, 242, 244; member of Committee on Future of College, 274n.2; planner of house system, 134; and response to sex sermon crisis, 130; retirement of, 208; and student life, 135
 Nicholson, Marjorie, 60
 Niles, Emory H.: on accepting government aid, 127; introduces resolution on war, 39–40; and land sale negotiations, 48; and 1950 campaign, 67, 68, 69, 261n.6; as planner of Towson campus, 31, 47, 61, 62, 68
 1950 campaign, 69
 Nitchie, Elizabeth, 95
 Noble, Enrique, 95
 Non-Western Studies program, 116
 Northwood Theater, 140
 Oates, Joyce Carol, 243
 O'Connor, Clare, 274n.2
 Off-campus experience requirement, xv, 40–41, 225
 Office of Price Administration (OPA), 42
 Ogilvie and Mather, Inc., 248

- Old Goucher College Historic District, 85
- Oppenheimer, J. Robert, 142
- Ottmann, Otto, 94
- Otto, Belle. *See* Talbot, Belle Otto
- Outcry, 211–212
- Overseers. *See* Board of Overseers
- Paley, Grace, 243
- Palmer, Richard R., 198–99, 246
- Pan-American Conference, 35
- Pancoast, Elinor, 97
- Pan-Hellenic Council, 28
- Pannell, Anne G., 96, 260n.58
- Parents' Weekend, 138
- Parietal rules, 154, 159–60
- Pass-fail grading, xiii, 111, 154
- Patterson, Barbara, 273n.30
- Peabody Institute, 113
- Peabody Institute Branch, 90, 265n.6
- Pearlstone, Jack, 206, 222, 239, 240
- Pearlstone Center, 213, 239, 240
- Pearson, Carol, 241
- Peirce, Brooke, 95, 194, 221
- Penofsky, Irwin, 142
- Performance facilities, in Kraushaar years, 141
- Perot Foundation, 181
- Perry, Marvin B., Jr., 143, 171, 192, 194, 242, 272n.2; assessment of, 149–50, 160, 189–91; created Committee on Future of College, 161; and finances, 178, 183–84, 187, 188; responds to student activism, 157–59; and student life, 154
- Personnel, reduction in: in Dorsey years, 198–203, 218–22; in Perry years, 181; in Robertson years, 37
- Petrou, Nicholas, 197–98, 199
- Phi Beta Kappa Society, 9
- Philosophy department, 10, 96, 200
- Physical Education: department, 10, 12, 19, 83–84, 100, 200, 254n.12; program, 24, 80, 229
- Physical Plant Compound, 79–80
- Physics department, 10, 21, 40, 99, 200
- Physiology and bacteriology. *See* Biological Sciences department
- Physiology and Hygiene department, 10, 21, 47–48, 254n.12, 259n.32. *See also* Biological Sciences department
- Planning Committee, faculty, 24, 31, 50, 69–70, 80, 82, 256n.40
- Plant Laboratory Annex, 84, 265n.56
- Political Science department, 10, 19–20, 40–41, 97
- Portuguese. *See* Modern Languages department
- Post-Baccalaureate Premedical Program, 281n.42
- Power House and Laundry, 85
- Preface, 137
- Presidential selection committee, 3, 50, 59, 143, 192
- President's boat ride, 136, 259n.56
- President's Council, 10, 12, 169
- Presidents' houses: Goucher House, 62, 87; Guth House, 62; on Joppa Road, 48, 60–61, 62, 79; on Towson campus, 62, 79
- Primrose, H. Clay, 39
- Princeton University debate club, 26
- Priorities and Planning Committee, 181, 206
- Prizes: Calvert, 210; Pulitzer, 39
- Probst, Carrie Mae 13, 83
- Probst House, 83
- Progressive Education movement, x–xi, 103
- Promotion, faculty committee on. *See* Planning Committee, faculty
- Protest, student. *See* Activism, student
- Prouty, Donna, 273n.30
- Psychology Annex, 84
- Psychology department, 10, 99
- Public Leadership Education Network (PLEN), 228
- Publications and Dramatics, Headquarters for, 85
- Pulitzer Prize, 39
- Purcell, Patricia P., 208, 233
- Quindecim*, 247, 251, 279n.13
- Quinn, Olive W., 97, 269n.7
- Rachuba, Larry, 240–41
- Racial discrimination, 125–27
- Ralph DeChiaro Enterprises, Inc., 89, 240
- Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure, committee on, 12, 209, 254n.8. *See also* Faculty: promotions; Tenure
- Registrar, office of, 13
- Religion department, 10, 12, 19, 96, 200
- Remedial work, 19
- Reno, Russell R., Jr., 240
- Reuss, Frederick G., 97
- Reverend's Rebels, 139
- Richardson, Emma R., 274n.2
- Riches, Naomi, 13, 27
- Richter Cornbrooks Matthaï Hopkins, Inc. (architects), 238
- Riding ring, 76
- Rigol, Sergio, 95
- Ritter, Waldemar H., 30
- Robertson, Anne K. (Mrs. David A.), 24–26, 39
- Robertson, David A., 3–4, 24–26, 39, 49, 50, 125, 259n.53; and academic program, x, 6, 13–14, 15, 19, 42–43; assessment of, 6, 53, 63–65, 189–91, 253n.5; and campus life, 27, 40, 45, 259n.56; on deanship, 80; on duties of vice president, 37; and finances, 6, 22–

- (continued Robertson, David A.)
 23, 30–31, 46, 61; and governance, 6, 10, 12, 18–19; library wing named for, 84; and Towson campus building, 23–24, 30–31, 34, 44, 68
- Robertson, Elizabeth B. (Mrs. David A.), 50, 259n.53
- Robinson, Edward L., 3, 31, 259n.32
- Robinson, Elizabeth B. (Mrs. Edward L.), 50
- Robinson, Myra D. (Mrs. Edward L.), 31, 259n.32
- Robinson-Bennett dormitory. *See* Anna Heubeck Hall; Bennett House; Robinson House
- Robinson House, 31, 47, 75, 259n.32, 263n.25
- Rockefeller, Nelson, 154
- Rogertian psychology, xiii
- Rogers, Julia, 49, 61, 69, 259n.48
- Rogers, Taliaferro and Lamb (architects), 79, 81
- Romance Languages department, 10. *See also* Modern Languages department
- Roosevelt, Franklin D., 26–27, 28, 35
- Rose, Annalies, 99
- Rose, Mary Carmen, 96
- Rosenberg, Ruth B., 142, 239
- Rosenberg Gallery, 239
- Rosovsky, Henry, xv
- Rosselet, Jeanne, 95
- Rossi, Alice S., 97
- Russian. *See* Modern Languages department
- Saarinan, Eliel and Eero (architects), 32
- Sachs, Susan M., 275n.24
- Safriet, Barbara, 156, 274n.2
- Salaries and wages, faculty and staff: in Dorsey years, 199; in Kraushaar years, 60, 61, 63, 100; in Perry years, 175, 180–83; in Robertson years, 21, 22–23
- Sasaki, Hideo, 77, 80, 82, 88, 91, 261n.4, 264n.9
- Sayre, Jessie Woodrow Wilson, 253n.6
- Schaefer, William Donald, 245
- Schary, Mrs. Saul, 269n.7
- Schmel, Robert C., 202
- Schroedl, Evelyn D., 274n.2, 281n.20
- Schwab, Diane, 273n.30
- Second bachelor's degree program, 230
- Seibert, Louise C., 266n.1
- Selective Service Act, 37
- Self-scheduled examinations, 154
- Sessrymner Hall, 45, 85
- 75th Anniversary Campaign, 81, 120–23
- 75th Anniversary celebration, 123–24, 269n.7
- Sexton, Ann, 142
- Shaumann, Herbert, 37
- Shelfoe, Joseph S., 11, 80
- Sherwood, John W., 31, 43, 49
- Ships with Goucher name, 43
- Signal Corps, U.S. Army, 40
- Skinner, Cornelia Otis, 49
- Skipper, Joshua, 60
- Smith College, xii, 60, 61, 65
- Snack bar, 239
- Sociology department, 97. *See also* Economics departments
- Sondheim, Walter, 127, 192, 199, 200, 207, 208, 269n.7, 174n.2
- Soper, Morris, 67, 126
- Sophomore general examinations: construction of, 18–19; elimination of, 108, 267n.16; President Kraushaar on, 64; purpose of, xi, 16, 103, 106
- Sororities, 51, 133–34, 258n.55, 260n.61
- Spanish. *See* Modern Languages department
- Special academic programs. *See* College teacher preparatory program; Graduate programs; Non-Western Studies program; Second bachelor's degree program; Study abroad programs
- Speers, Guthrie, 130
- Spencer, Eleanor, 42, 50, 59, 93, 113, 269n.7
- Spender, Stephen, 142
- Spillers, Hortense, 243
- Stable, 76
- Stark, Arlynn, 230
- Sternlicht, Marilyn, 274n.2
- Stevenson, Adlai, 138–39
- Stimson, Dorothy: acting presidency of, 5, 24; and college budget, 254n.9; on Clinton Winslow, 31; naming of hall for, 79; on "New Plan," 17; on President Guth, 4–5, 29–30; as professor of history, 96; resignation as dean, 50, 259n.57; talks by, 24
- Stimson Hall. *See* Dorothy Stimson Hall
- Stimson Lectures, 142, 259n.57
- Strategic Plan (1982), 235–36, 248–49
- Strike of service and maintenance personnel, 236–38. *See also* Union, employees
- Stroh, William R., 99
- Student activism. *See* Activism, student
- Student Center, 91, 213, 239
- Student life: in Dorsey years, 211–14, 239, 241–42; in Kraushaar years, 74, 132–43; in Perry years, 191; in Robertson years, 24–28, 34–37, 39, 40–42, 45, 47, 51–53. *See also* Activism, student; Anti-war movement activities; Desegregation, racial; Morale, student
- Students: characteristics of, 101, 189–90; preparation of, 19; relationship with President Kraushaar, 143; response of, to coeducation, 247, 250;


- response of, to new campus, 44, 45, 46, 132-35; response of, to 1934 curriculum, 17. *See also* Activism, student; Admissions, student; Enrollment; Morale, student; Student life; Students' Organization
- Students' Organization, 27, 39, 52, 155, 247
- Study abroad programs, 34-35, 112, 268n.30
- Summerfield Baldwin Foundation, 240
- Summer sessions, 40, 42-43, 112-113, 230
- Suranyi-Unger, Theodore, Jr., 97
- Sweet Briar College, 35, 191
- Swimming Pool, Eline von Borries, 83-84
- Talbot, Belle Otto, 99, 269n.7
- Tamblyn and Brown, Inc., 24
- Tatum, Beulah, 97
- Taylor, Samuel N., 99
- Ten Eyck, Marianne, 281n.20
- Tenure, 10-11, 180, 203, 210. *See also* Personnel, reduction in
- Termination of faculty positions. *See* Personnel, reduction in
- Theater department, 94, 243
- Thinglestad, Stephanie L., 275n.24
- Thomas, Emma, 27, 118
- Thomas, J. Richard, 236
- Thomas, Norman, 27, 28, 137-38
- Thomas, Thaddeus P., 3, 12, 96
- Thompson, Holmes, and Converse (architects), 32
- Thomsen, George, 201-2
- Thomsen, Roszel C., 5, 32-33, 38, 81, 89
- Thomson, Vergil, 142
- Thormann, Wolfgang E., 95, 210-11, 230, 266n.1, 279n.9
- Thurmond, Strom, 137
- Tiffany, Louis Comfort, 243
- Tiffany window, 243-44
- Tillich, Paul, 142
- Tippett, Sir Michael, 142
- Todd, Elizabeth, 121, 269n.4
- Todd, George, 121, 186, 269n.4, 276n.39
- Todd professorship, 121, 269n.4
- Tolley, Vlada, 95
- Tone Committee, 28, 51-53, 260n.64
- Torrey, Marian M., 98
- Towson Corner, 33, 48-49
- Towson Methodist Church, 90, 265n.5
- Towson Plaza Shopping Center, 82-83, 240, 265n.3. *See also* Towson town Shopping Center
- Towson State Teachers College, 46
- Towson State University, 193
- Towson town Shopping Center, 33, 49
- See also* Towson Plaza Shopping Center
- Trudheim Hall, 45
- Truman, Harry S., 137
- Trustee actions: in 1926-40: 4, 9-12, 13, 21, 23, 24, 31, 32-33, 34; in 1941-48: 37-38, 39-40, 43, 45, 49, 50-51; in 1848-50: 59, 68, 69, 70, 73; in 1953-66: 75-77, 79-83, 84, 85, 126-29, 130-31, 143; in 1967-73: 159, 160, 171-73, 175, 185-88, 192, 263n.2; in 1973-80: 197-203, 205, 206, 207-8, 209-10, 216, 238; in 1980-86: 218, 221-22, 235-36, 238, 247, 248-51
- Trustee-faculty relations, committee on. *See* Faculty Personnel Policies Committee
- Tuition and fees, increases in, 44-45, 51, 178-79, 198-99, 205
- Turner, Horation W., 37
- Tuttle House, 263n.2
- UNESCO, 42
- Union, employees, 182, 236-38
- Unionization of hourly wage workers, 182. *See also* Strike of service and maintenance personnel
- Urey, Harold, 142
- Vanaheim Hall, 45
- Van Meter, John B., 48, 231
- Van Meter Hall: construction of, 47, 69; gift of alumnae, 31; name of, 48; President Kraushaar on, 60; renovation of, 84, 238-39; uses of, 48, 73, 141, 263n.25
- Van Schaack, Eric, 94
- Velder, Eli, 97, 275n.24, 279n.9
- Venture, 137
- Verdy, Violette, 243
- Veterans, returning, 43, 63
- Vice president, office of, 37, 50
- Vingolf Hall, 46, 48
- Visual Arts. *See* Art department
- Viti, Ethel, 250-251
- Vosgerchian, Luise, 243
- Wagley, Mary Frances P., 274n.2
- Wagner, Hester Corner, 82, 118
- Wagner, Mrs. Robert, 269n.7
- Wagner House, 82
- Walker, Kenneth O., 96, 113, 116, 125, 192, 207, 209, 269n.7
- Walker, Lewis A., 99, 228
- Walkout, student, from 1969 Convocation, 152, 156-57
- Wallace, Henry, 137
- Walters Art Gallery, 213
- Wang, Christine W., 230
- War, Second World, 20-21, 34, 39-43, 46

- Warshawsky, Marilyn S., 281n.20
 Watkins, Judge R. Dorsey, 203-4
 Wayne State University, 140
 Webb, H. Marguerite, 99
 Webb, James L. A., 99, 245n.22
 Wednesday program, 113-14
Weekly, Goucher College: in Dorsey years, 211-12, 213-14, 215, 229, 256n.59, 279n.13; in Kraushaar years, 136-140, 143; in Perry years, 154, 155, 156; in Robertson years, 24-27, 28, 35-37, 40, 42, 45, 46, 52-53
 Wehr, Frederick, 161
 Welsh, Lilian, 44, 254n.12, 259n.32
 Wesleyan University, 191
 Western High School (Baltimore), 101, 266n.4
 Whitaker, Mrs. Milton C., 269n.7
 White, Fred H., 279n.9
 White, Roy, 71
 White, Stanford, 62
 Wilcox, Mary, 118
 Wilham W. Guth Memorial Gateway, 46, 75-76
 Wilhams, John C., 95
 Wilhams, Mary Wilhelmine, 96
 Williams, William Carlos, 142
 Williamson, C. H., 48
 Willkie, Wendell, 42
 Wilner, Eleanor, 274n.2
 Wilson, Donald H., 185
 Wilson, Frederick, 243
 Wilson, Winifred, L., 274n.2
 Wilson, Woodrow, 253n.6
 Wilson and Christie (architects), 82
 Winslow, Clinton I.: awards received by, 83; Dorothy Stimson on, 31; on international relations major, 20; as member of presidential selection committee, 50, 59; on President Robertson, 6; as professor of political science, 97; role in campus construction, 31, 49-50, 69-70, 261n.4; talks by, 24
 Winslow, Ola, 39, 40, 95
 Winslow House, 83
 Women's Management Development Program, 231, 280n.38
 Wood, Frederick, 129-31, 271n.16
 Writing Center, 229
 Wyatt, Dorothea E., 96
 Wyhe, Ruth A., 99

 Yale University, 256 n.12

 Zander machines, 24, 256n.44

Designed by Chris L. Hotvedt
Composed by The Composing Room of Michigan, Inc. in Sabon text and
display
Printed by The Maple Press Company on 60-lb Glatfelter Eggshell A-50
Offset paper and bound in Holliston Roxite A



(continued from front flap)

footing; yet diminishing enrollments forced the college to reexamine its century-old mission. Musser's history ends with Goucher's decision to become coeducational.

Frederic O. Musser has taught at Goucher College since 1964. He has served as chairman of the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures and as assistant to the president. Since 1970 he has been professor of French.

The Goucher College Series

Jacket design by Glen Burris

"The story of Goucher is the story of an institution that has embraced change while maintaining a solid foundation. Goucher's past has helped set the stage for successful transition—economically, academically, and spiritually—as Goucher enters its second century of providing superior liberal arts education."

—Dr. Rhoda M. Dorsey,
President, Goucher College



The Johns Hopkins University Press
Baltimore and London
ISBN 0-8018-3902-5

